

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 19 }
WHOLE No. 513 }

FEBRUARY 15, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—In the Archangel region during the first part of the week the British and American forces together with Russian units were obliged to retire for *Military Movements*, some distance before Bolsheviki Feb. 3, p.m.-Feb. 10, troops. But at the end of the week, a.m.

in cooperation with British and Russian sections, American machine-gun and trench-mortar units began an attack on the enemy on the Petrograd road south of Kadish. Here Canadian artillery covered the advance of the Allied and associated troops, the attack being made to protect the flank of the American positions at Sredmakrenga to which our forces were obliged to retire last week. Our lines in the Vaga sector were constantly and heavily shelled. The movements in progress on the Kadish-Petrograd road may lead to serious consequences. Kadish is directly east and at a short distance from the Archangel-Vologda-Petrograd railway. If the Bolsheviki become masters of the territory about the town they will cut off the British and associated troops from rail communication with Archangel, and the counter-offensive of the last few days was evidently meant to wrest from the Bolsheviki the strategic advantage which they obtained last week and which, since then, they have greatly improved.

In the beginning of the week, Mr. Wilson presided at the opening meeting of the Commission on the Society of Nations at the apartments of Colonel House in Paris.

The Peace Conference; As far as can be ascertained from a *The Society of study of the various reports of the Nations* accredited correspondents of the great American and foreign newspapers, Premier Lloyd George seemed disposed to back up the American delegation in the colonial policy outlined last week. Premier Hughes was still reported to have withheld his final agreement to any plan which would deprive Australia from full control of the former German colonies in the Pacific. On this point the Japanese signified their full accord with the plan of the Conference.

Early in the week President Wilson addressed the French Chamber of Deputies, in the hearing of many of the prominent delegates to the Conference and distinguished guests present in the gallery. After speaking of the menacing conditions that prevail beyond the Rhine, across Poland, Russia, and Asia, and stating that

France stood now as during the war at the "frontier of freedom," the President, referring to the relations of peoples, said:

The rulers of the world have been thinking of the relations of governments and forgetting the relations of peoples. They have been thinking of the maneuvers of international dealings, when what they ought to have been thinking of was the fortunes of men and women and the safety of home, and the care that they should take that their people should be happy because they were safe. They know that the only way to do this is to make it certain that the same thing will not always happen that has happened this time, that there never shall be any doubt or waiting or surmise, but that whenever France or any free people is threatened, the whole world will be ready to vindicate its liberty. It is for that reason, I take it, that I find such a warm and intelligent enthusiasm in France for the Society of Nations—France with her keen vision, France with her prophetic vision. It seems to be not only the need of France, but the need of mankind. And France sees the sacrifices which are necessary for the establishment of the Society of Nations are not to be compared with the constant dread of another catastrophe falling on the fair cities and areas of France.

The close of the week found the members of the Conference divided for a time at least on a vital question. There was a disagreement between the great Powers and the lesser Powers represented at the Conference as to the proportion of representation to be allowed small nations and their power in decision. According to one plan, the great Powers would have a representation of ten members on the executive tribunal of the League, and the small nations nine. This plan seemed to be the one preferred by the small nations. Another plan provided for no permanent representation for small nations in the executive body of the League, nor for their consideration there except when their interests would be brought up before the tribunal. The great Powers seemed to be of the opinion that a plan would not be desirable that would give the lesser nations the power to block policies that would be far more momentous than the affairs of lesser nationalities.

In the middle and towards the close of the week, the procedure for the settlement of disputes after the League has been established was in doubt. The question was long discussed whether the use of economic pressure would be sufficient to force recalcitrant members of the League to agree with the final verdict of that body. But

a special cable to the *New York Times* of February 8 stated that the plans for the League were rapidly taking shape and were tentatively approved by the commission of which President Wilson is Chairman. According to a statement of Ferdinand Larnaude, the associate of Léon Bourgeois as one of the French members of the League Commission, the plans go further in the use and application of force than was at first contemplated in the American program.

In M. Larnaude's view the present plan calls for a League with an executive committee, with full powers, always in session. This committee will consist of ten or twelve members appointed by the larger Powers but acting for the entire League. The League will appoint a judicial tribunal before which the executive body may summon the nations to appear and settle their differences. Each year there will sit an international parliament, composed of delegates of every nation, to consider world legislation. "There is to be an international force, consisting of army and navy. Each nation is to maintain its part of this army within its own borders, subject to call by the executive body of the League to serve wherever needed." This force is to be used only to compel the prospective belligerents to make use of the "preliminary machinery" of the League to settle their differences without war. If this fails, the League will interfere no more, except to see that the belligerents observe the rules to be laid down by the League in the actual contest of arms. Economic boycotts and similar measures may be used to prevent war. Without the military force at the disposal of the League, France thinks that the League would be of no avail to protect her against the attacks of Germany. In outlining this plan, M. Larnaude stated that the chief danger of wars in the future lay in Germany, the Balkans, and the new States recently formed in Eastern Europe.

The Soviet Government by accepting the invitation of the Conference to a *pourparler* with delegates of the Conference at the Prinkipo Islands in the Sea of Marmora, also signified its willingness to acknowledge its financial indebtedness to individuals in Allied territory—such debts having been formerly threatened with disavowal—and a willingness to enter upon friendly negotiations and to come to terms with the Governments whose forces are in Russia, and to cease all hostilities. It was announced, February 7, that William Allen White, of Emporia, Kan., editor of the *Emporia Gazette*, a former member of the Progressive party, and Professor George D. Herron had been appointed the American delegates to the Prinkipo Islands conference with the Russian factions. Dr. Herron is known to be in sympathy with Bolshevik doctrines, believes in trial marriages and is a confessed advocate of the Socialist State. His views brought him in the past into conflict with an Iowa college where he taught "applied Christianity," and with the First Congregational Church, Burlington, Iowa, whose pastorate he was obliged to resign. He divorced his first

wife, and, it is said, put his trial marriage views in practice by taking a second wife without marriage vows civil or ecclesiastical.

Australia.—Early in December the Catholics of Sydney were filled with just indignation at the refusal of the Federal quarantine authorities to allow a priest to visit the patients in the Quarantine Hospital who were dying of influenza. About a dozen Catholics,

Serious Quarantine Scandal it is reported, died without the priest, owing to the Government's pagan attitude, but the case of Miss Egan was the one that caused the uproar. She was a Catholic nurse who had volunteered to take care of the quarantined influenza patients, and while zealously doing her duty, she caught the disease herself and was soon in a dying condition. Though Miss Egan begged repeatedly that a priest be called, the hospital authorities refused to allow any clergyman to pass into the quarantine area, so Miss Egan died without the Last Sacraments.

The Archbishop of Sydney, Most Rev. Dr. Kelly, then addressed a letter to Dr. Elkington, who was in charge of the hospital, requesting that a priest be at once admitted into the quarantined zone. Dr. Elkington referred his Grace to the Prime Minister. The Archbishop forthwith sent a formal request to the acting Prime Minister and then went to the hospital and demanded admission saying: "There are patients dangerously and seriously ill to whose spiritual needs it is my duty to attend. I am come for that purpose, and am ready to remain in quarantine as long as necessary." But the guard refused to let the Archbishop enter, saying a written permission from Dr. Elkington was required. His Grace then withdrew. A few days later the Archbishop presided at a meeting of protest at which the following resolution, as reported by the *Southern Cross*, was unanimously carried:

That this meeting of Catholics, assembled under the presidency of his Grace the Archbishop, protests most strongly against the action of the authorities of the quarantine station in placing obstacles in the way of a priest presenting himself for residence in the quarantine area for the purpose of administering to the sick and dying, and this meeting strongly protests against the pretext used in the shape of military chaplains, and also as to personal temperament, and, as a number of souls have passed away without receiving the last rites of the Church whilst the priest was asking for admittance, appeals in the name of Christianity and humanity to the Prime Minister to appoint a commission of inquiry to report upon the extraordinary attitude of the authorities in this matter.

Dr. Elkington's reason for refusing the permission, it is said, was that if a Catholic priest were allowed into the quarantine the various Protestant denominations would also apply, and that there were no quarters in quarantine ready for such purposes. The matter subsequently was brought before the Australian Parliament, and it was decided that each religious denomination should select a clergyman to care for quarantined pa-

tients, that he should be inoculated and, after attending to the sick, he should go into quarantine himself. Dr. Elkington, however, and other physicians, it is said, pass freely from the quarantine station to the city, of Sydney, due precautions being taken, of course, against spreading the disease. Naturally the question arises: Why cannot clergymen be made as free as doctors from the danger of carrying germs?

Germany.—The German National Assembly opened at Weimar February 6 in the famous Court Theater which had been converted into a legislative hall. Chancellor

Opening of National Assembly

Ebert greeted the Assembly as "the sovereign power by which the German people will have self-rule."

Need, he said, had delivered Germany to her enemies, but he protested against being made a slave to them for thirty, forty or sixty years to come. "Our enemies declare that they are fighting militarism, but militarism has been dethroned." He branded the armistice terms as unheard of and ruthless. The whole Assembly joined in his protest against the expulsion of Germans from Alsace and the sequestration of property, and broke into shouts of indignation as he referred to the 800,000 prisoners of war still held in captivity. The Germans, he said, laid down their arms with confidence in President Wilson, and the present free Government of Germany believed it was only its right to enter the League of Nations and work with real energy. "We turn therefore to all the peoples of the world for justice. We ask that our economic life be not destroyed. The German people have fought for inner self-determination." He described the existing Provisional Government as the executor of a bankrupt régime, and was heartily cheered when he referred to the proposed union of Germany and Austria, hoping that the bonds sundered in 1866 would again be sealed.

In the balloting that took place on the following day Dr. Eduard David, a Majority Socialist and for many years a leader in the Social Democratic party, was almost

Dr. David Elected President

unanimously elected president of the Assembly. He received 374 out of a total of 399 votes, the Inde-

pendent Socialists refraining from casting their votes. The same number of votes was also given to the Centrist Fehrenbach and the Democrat Haussmann as vice-presidents. This therefore would seem to point to an agreement that had been reached between the various parties before the balloting took place. The Conservative Dietrich received 356 votes as the third vice-president. Participation of the Centrists in the formation of the future cabinet is said to be assured by their determination to work with the new Government. Dr. David's speech differed little from the opening address delivered by Chancellor Ebert. The old German structure, he said, had been destroyed, and he appealed to the Assembly to build up a new and better house. Political self-discipline,

he declared, was a pre-condition to political self-determination. Germany was a country ripe for democracy, but he warned the members that the eyes of the people of the world were directed towards them. Germany, he added, must understand how to bridge the gulf to bring about a universal cooperation. His greeting to Alsace-Lorraine and the declaration that Germany would not cease to insist upon the right of self-determination evoked a great ovation.

The Centrist party has again resumed its old name. Herr Pfeiffer, one of the Centrist leaders and a former Reichstag member, observed: "We do not feel that we

Centrists Resume Former Name

really ought to call ourselves the Christian party." The Centrists have eighty-eight delegates at the As-

sembly and it is understood that the Guelphs will join them on all important questions. Discussing the future of the Socialists, Herr Pfeiffer said:

The appointment for Provisional President and Chancellor will be for a few months only, to span the interval until a general election, and it is conceivable that the bourgeois delegates may consider it wise to give the Socialists enough rope to hang themselves by demonstrating still further their incapacity to govern.

Twelve residents of Alsace arrived in Weimar. They had been chosen as delegates by numerous Alsatian refugees and came to offset as far as possible the French prohibition against elections in Alsace, having conducted their election by mail. The Spartacides have vainly sought to bring about disturbances in Weimar, and street fighting has again occurred in Berlin and elsewhere; the insurrections, however, are not of a serious nature.

On February 8 a provisional constitution was adopted empowering the Assembly to draw up a permanent constitution and to enact such national laws as are urgently necessary. It provides for the elec-

Provisional Constitution Adopted

tion of a national President by a majority vote and the creation of a

"Committee of State" which shall be equivalent to a quasi-second chamber. The territory of the German States is not to be altered without their consent. No other attempts are made to limit the future permanent constitution or prescribe for it. Efforts will be made, it is said, to include a paragraph definitely forbidding the separation of Church and State. The Assembly will probably adjourn on April 11 and reconvene at Berlin. In opposition to the Constituent Assembly the Congress of Soldiers' Councils has adopted a resolution summoning a general congress of all the German Soviets for February 20. The purpose of the Soviets is to fight for the undiminished retention of their authority. The ordinance of the Minister of War, affecting this authority, is declared illegal and new revolutionary outbreaks are threatened.

Great Britain.—On February 4 Parliament met to begin what promises to be a most important session. None

of the Sinn Feiners elected from Ireland appeared at the opening meeting, and with no disturbance of the usual order, J. W. Lowther was elected Speaker. Problems connected with finance will, it is thought, occupy Parliament's first consideration, and with these solved, the budget will be taken up. Four new Ministries, dealing with supply, ways and communications, health, and commerce, will probably be proposed by the Government. There will also be land and housing bills, a bill looking to the restoration of pre-war practices in industry, and an important bill on the restriction of immigration.

Very little news of the labor troubles in Great Britain has been cabled to the United States during the last week, and this reticence suggests an unusually active censor.

Labor Difficulties

On February 7 it was announced that a number of strikers had been arrested in Belfast, on warrants charging conspiracy against the public peace, and on the following day the Board of Trade stated that the London tube difficulties had been satisfactorily adjusted. No details, however, were given. By February 1 conditions among the shipworkers and miners seemed rising to a climax, but nothing has been reported since that date. Some of the newspapers profess to see in the strikes an uprising of anarchy and pro-Germanism, and the *Times* says that every worker must ask himself whether he wishes to see the excesses of Petrograd repeated in London, or to help establish Bolshevism in Great Britain. The *Westminster Gazette* probably comes closer to an accurate diagnosis in saying that much of the difficulty was made inevitable by the war. A strong definite labor policy formulated by the Government, will, in the opinion of this journal, restore industrial peace.

Ireland.—The Irish papers containing accounts of the sittings of the *Dail Eireann*, or National Assembly, have just reached America. The twenty-nine members present rose in a body and subscribed to a declaration of complete independence for Ireland. Then besides adopting a constitution the Assembly sent a message to the free nations of the world, a document that was scrupulously excluded from American papers. The message is as follows:

To the Nations of the World, Greeting:

The nation of Ireland having proclaimed her national independence, calls, through her elected representatives in Parliament assembled in the Irish Capital on January 21, 1919, upon every free nation to support the Irish Republic by recognizing Ireland's national status and her right to its vindication by the Peace Congress.

Nationally, the race, the language, the customs and traditions of Ireland are radically distinct from the English. Ireland is one of the most ancient nations of Europe, and she has preserved her national integrity, vigorous and intact through seven centuries of foreign oppression; she has never relinquished her national rights, and throughout the long era of English usurpation she has in every generation defiantly proclaimed her in-

alienable right of nationhood down to her last glorious resort to arms in 1916.

Internationally, Ireland is the gateway to the Atlantic. Ireland is the last outpost of Europe towards the West; Ireland is the point upon which great trade routes between East and West converge; her independence is demanded by the freedom of the seas; her great harbors must be open to all nations, instead of being the monopoly of England. Today these harbors are empty and idle solely because English policy is determined to retain Ireland as a barren bulwark for English aggrandizement, and the unique geographical position of this island, far from being a benefit and safeguard to Europe and America, is subjected to the purposes of England's policy of world dominion.

Ireland today reasserts her historic nationhood the more confidently before the new world emerging from the war, because she believes in freedom and justice as the fundamental principles of international law, because she believes in a frank co-operation between the peoples for equal rights against the vested privileges of ancient tyrannies, because the permanent peace of Europe can never be secured by perpetuating military dominion for the profit of empire, but only by establishing the control of government in every land upon the basis of the free will of a free people, and the existing state of war, between Ireland and England, can never be ended until Ireland is definitely evacuated by the armed forces of England.

For these, among other reasons, Ireland resolutely and irrevocably determined at the dawn of the promised era of self-determination and liberty, that she will suffer foreign dominion no longer calls upon every free nation to uphold her national claim to complete independence as an Irish Republic against the arrogant pretensions of England founded in fraud and sustained only by an overwhelming military occupation, and demands to be confronted publicly with England at the Congress of Nations, that the civilized world having judged between English wrong and Irish right may guarantee to Ireland its permanent support for the maintenance of her national independence.

Mexico.—Most Americans know how elections are conducted in many Latin countries, but they have never read the details of the fraud. They will therefore be interested in these confidential instructions issued under date of December 2 to the officials of Pasos de Soto.

The Farce of Elections

1. One or two polling places must be erected outside of the town in order that a good number of our votes may be registered there.
2. Care must be taken to appoint trustworthy persons as election managers. These may be city officials, for the managers are members of the board of electoral overseers, which issues the credentials.
3. The presiding officer at the polls should be a trustworthy friend. He can also be one of the city officials, for the reason stated above.
4. A secretary should be appointed to sign for those who do not know how to write. He also must be a trustworthy man, in order to certify to the ballots of all those who have been registered, whether they vote or not.
5. All friends must be registered, even should they neglect to do so themselves. With the opponents or with the indifferent we must hope that they will register.
6. No other candidacy but our own must be entered.
7. If, in spite of this, the election is lost in some districts, the result must be returned to the Congress instead of the returning board in order that the votes be not counted by the latter.
8. If unfortunately it appears probable that our candidates should be beaten in the greater part of the district, then care must be taken that there be no returning board in order that no one may receive his credentials of election: these must be issued to our candidates and to no other.

The Carranzistas carried all the districts.

League of Nations Projects

J. C. WALSH,

Staff Correspondent of AMERICA

ALTHOUGH it is still the fashion to speak of the League of Nations as a visionary ideal, the fact remains that the United States, Great Britain and France have committees at work studying the possibilities. At first, undoubtedly, their work runs to the confrontation of difficulties, but it will be odd if the cumulative effort of highly trained minds does not result in solutions being found.

There are, to begin with, three distinct conceptions of the project. The first, and the one which might be expected to be found uppermost in the minds of the men now in Paris, begins and ends with the conception of the sovereign State. The second puts in the front rank the idea of a judiciary. The third is based upon the objection of humanity in general to such destruction of life as has recently been witnessed. If the three conceptions can be wisely accommodated, then something worth while can be done. The difficulty at present is that men whose minds are filled with the sense of their responsibility as spokesmen of sovereign States, whose immediate interests are more or less in conflict, may have some reluctance to depart from their present role. In all the proposals advanced by them so far, only two eventualities are contemplated, first, a set of conditions in which war is imminent, and second, a conference between the Prime Ministers, Foreign Secretaries, or other principal officers of the sovereign States, with a view to seeing what pressure can be brought to bear to prevent the actual outbreak or, if it must come, to overwhelm the outlaw. The League of Nations, in this view of its efficacy, is to be based on an arrangement for the application, if necessary, of irresistible force. Such a League commends itself so little that even its advocates make all kinds of reserves. M. Clemenceau, in his frank way, expresses his satisfaction provided the weight of the League is always on the side of France. In England they made two important provisions against mischance. Foreseeing the possibility of a decision contrary to British interests, they shrink from any engagement under which British force could be called into requisition as a matter of course; against the still more unpleasant possibility of the resources of the League being invoked against England, they insist upon their claim to naval supremacy, the ultimate object of which is to protect England against that economic exclusion which is to be one of the League's most powerful weapons.

The advocates of the judicial, as opposed to the military, conception of the League are troubled by the inability to establish conditions in which judicial action is ordinarily effective. As at present contemplated, the parties in interest before such a tribunal as might be set up would be sovereign States, and the constituent body

upon which the judicature would rest would consist also of sovereign States. Yet the very essence of a sovereign State is that it does not and will not and cannot recognize or admit, as against its own interest, any authority superior to its own. To set up a court from whose jurisdiction the major occasions of war could be withdrawn, as happened at the Hague, would be to make the court inoperative where it was not made ridiculous. To leave to such a court full control, and to supply it with the means of enforcing its decisions, would be to abandon the conception of the sovereign State as now understood and practised, and, probably, to forego that right of a State to assert itself, subject to the limitations of power and the dictates of prudence, which in all countries has hitherto been considered inalienable.

Finally, with one set of the recent combatants exalted by victory and another set depressed by defeat, very little concern need be shown, and here in Paris very little is shown, at this moment, for the views of the masses who supplied the millions of slain and mutilated victims of this war and who would make the same contribution to the next, being burdened meantime by increase of debt, by destruction of capital, and by dislocation of their private fortunes. Humanity, as humanity, is not represented at the Peace Conference, which is an assemblage of the directing minds of the organized Governments of sovereign States.

Those who began to study the possibilities of permanent peace quickly realized that Mr. Wilson is not entitled to any patent on the score of original discovery. The Clemenceau idea, that the victors have in their own hands the means of making peace permanent, is found to conform to the idea of Alexander the Great, and to that of Imperial Rome. During the Middle Ages the Papacy sought to maintain peace by the exercise of spiritual authority, and Lord Hugh Cecil, who was returned the other day to a Parliament from which he has long been absent, signalized his political resurrection by a speech in which he questioned whether the world is as enlightened in these matters in this materialist age as it was in the days when acceptance of Christian ideals was universal in Europe. The favorite employment of Napoleon at St. Helena was the elaboration of a plan of world peace. In Tolstoi's "Peace and War," which deals with Russia in 1805, one finds on the first page a reference to the "influenza, or grippe," and on the second a reference to the ideal of permanent peace. Henri IV and Queen Elizabeth are supposed to have concurred on a "grand design" to insure the peace of Europe, as was said, but really to control Austria. In 1713, while the Peace of Utrecht was in preparation, the Abbé de St. Pierre, one of the French plenipotentiaries, drew up a working

scheme for a League of Princes, under the terms of which, differences were to be settled by arbitration or judicial decision at a congress of plenipotentiaries, and the League was to impose by force of arms the common will upon recalcitrant States. A hundred years later, after the Napoleonic wars, Castlereagh secured the introduction of clauses into the earlier treaties under which the spokesmen of England, Russia, Austria and Prussia could meet and talk things over at frequent intervals, reaching agreement and imposing their united will. Within five years the Powers of the Holy Alliance were uniting too straitly and imposing too much, whereupon England called in the new world to redress the balance of the old, and the Monroe Doctrine made its appearance. Perhaps the nearest approach to a working congress of princes was that by means of which the German confederation was carried on in the middle of the last century. The "Recollections of Bismarck" make it quite clear that its main usefulness was to provide an arena for the rival ambitions of Austria and Prussia, the plenipotentiaries of these and all the other States being mere instruments of the policies of the courts which sent them.

On the other hand, the peace efforts made at the Hague overemphasized the importance of the judicial function. The world respects judicial decisions, and may even accede to verdicts in which judicial decision is modified by arrangements designed to satisfy one of the contestants without too much offense to the other. The prime necessity, however, where there is recourse to the law, whether municipal or international, is that there shall be in the community affected a readiness, nay a determination, to uphold the law. The Hague effort was participated in by able lawyers who were, in the end, only the representatives of sovereign States, each of which States disclaimed the existence of any super-national authority, and some of which, as the event proved, were prepared at need to base all legal definition upon the degree of force with which they could back its assertion. Lord Parker, a great British jurist, in a speech in the House of Lords (March 19, 1918) went to the root of the matter when he said:

At the present day a law may be defined as a rule of conduct generally observed, and exceptional deviations from it are punished by tribunals based upon force. A little consideration will show that, even at the present day, though tribunals based upon force may deal with exceptional deviations from the general rule of conduct, no tribunal and no force is of any avail at all when once the exceptions are so numerous that the rule cannot be said to be generally observed.

Plainly, if one looks at the organized Governments as they manifest their tendencies here at the Peace Conference, to say nothing of the exhibitions given during the war and before the war, it is to be foreseen that in any arrangement for the future under which the sovereign State would be the unit, there would be as many "exceptions," in the sense in which Lord Parker uses the word, as there were States represented. The mere constitution of a court would not, therefore, necessarily ensure the

permanence of peace, any more than it would be ensured by periodical or occasional conferences between ministers representing Powers which may have been in alliance yesterday but some of which may be in conflict tomorrow.

"The true line of development," Lord Parker added, after pointing out that hardly a single recommendation of the Hague conferences had survived the war, "lies not in regulating the hateful thing but in bringing about conditions under which it becomes increasingly difficult and ultimately impossible." The main obstacle in the way of bringing about the desired condition is the present difficulty of establishing anything like uniformity in the way the peoples of the world look at the problems from which wars arise. Within each sovereign State the currents of opinion can be, and are, directed towards support of the plans of the Government of that State. "Each country sees nothing but light on its own side, nothing but shadow on the other." How, in that condition, can there be full application of the dictum of Sir Frederick Pollock that "Surrender of the liberty to assert one's claim to force can only be in exchange for reasonable assurance of judgment and justice?"

There are two conditions to which those look forward with hopefulness, who do not see much hope in any scheme which rests upon the sovereign State as the unit of construction, whether the organized government of that State speaks through one of its directing spirits or through a judge selected by those in control. First is that the plain people of the world, as distinguished from the States into which they are organized, have a wider outlook than their fellows had in 1815 or in 1714. Second is that many millions of the components of this mass of humanity have gone back from the war with a message to communicate to their families and their friends. There has been constituted under pressure a society numbering tens of millions of members who are opposed to war, who know where war finds its victims, and who have political power in their hands if they want to exercise it. On them, and on humanity generally, rather than upon organized governments, dependence must be placed for maintaining that "rule of conduct generally observed" which can be the only stable foundation for international law. To them, rather than to the organized governments, recourse must be had if conditions are to be brought about under which war "becomes increasingly difficult and ultimately impossible." Courts may react decisions, and States may enforce penalties, but it is more and more agreed that only the peoples themselves can establish the conditions under which war will become abhorrent to the point of being intolerable.

Statesmen who have found themselves confronted with the essential weakness involved in projects for a league of governments, attracted by the prospects of a league of peoples, and recognizing the necessity of supporting the rule of law by the formation of opinion as well as by the sanctions of force, are seeking for the means by

which the combination can be made. They look forward to the existence of a People's House, functioning continuously, the members of which would not be appointed by governments but directly elected by the people and directly charged with the mission of working for peace. They see such a body including in its membership directly chosen representatives of every national entity; whatever its political statutes, they see bureaus of investigation accumulating information on all manner of peace-disturbing issues from all quarters of the world. They see investigation giving place to discussion and discussion to legislation. They see recommendations issuing from this body, representative of humanity in general, for adoption by the legislatures of the several States. They see produced the materials from which people may inform themselves, no longer with all light on one side of a po-

litical boundary and all shadow on the other. They see humanity arrayed against war and a rule of conduct formed under which the awards of international courts will be honored.

But they also see the principals in the Peace Conference, or some of them, so eagerly intent upon carving the carcasses of this and that empire as to be uncertain whether there is any conscious concern whatever for mere humanity; whether the League of Nations is anything more than a convenient subject on which to engage conversation while business of immediate and intimate importance is being dispatched. Italy, in her cold, calculating way, is postponing a show of interest in the projects concerning the League until such time as the business in which she is now interested is disposed of. If then there is to be a League of Nations she will study the conditions.

Ulster, the Wisconsin of Ireland

P. A. FORDE

I OWE Wisconsin an apology for my title. I use the name of that sane, progressive State merely by way of illustration. Many people in Wisconsin and elsewhere think that La Follette has been called a pro-German just because he proposed the taxation of war-profits; he wanted to make the profiteers pay for the war. The profiteers hold strings which, being pulled, make the politicians and the journalists of this fair land dance appropriately. Some Wisconsin people think their State has got a bad name through the agency of business rivals in other States. On this point there is a very interesting communication from a Wisconsin man to the December number of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

At all events an idea has been widely spread through the nation that the Kaiser kept a strong German colony in Wisconsin. He paid them well, it is said, gave them the full benefit of *kultur*, taught them to despise Uncle Sam and hamper his war measures. If the facts were so, then no doubt the Kaiser ought to have protested against the "coercion" of Wisconsin. His colony there was "loyal" to him and to *kultur* and it was and is outrageous to force its members into union with aliens, aliens in language, religion, and history, aliens in culture and *kultur*. I am ready to believe that many editorial tears have been shed in Germany over the hard fate of Wisconsin.

What Wisconsin is alleged to be, what political and commercial enemies want us to believe Wisconsin to be, that Ulster is, an alien colony, artificially created and artificially conserved in the bosom of a nation in the interests of a foreign Power. Ulster is distinctly a "manufactured article," an artificial product. The creators and preservers of Ulster are the Junkers of England, the men who destroyed the Boer Republic and who are now in power again with Lloyd George as a figurehead to fool the democracy of England and of the world. They have their reasons for holding Ireland,

and they are exactly the reasons the Prussians had for holding Belgium, the reasons Captain Kidd had for holding every ship he captured. But Ulster is their excuse. Ulster was conceived and begotten and nursed and coddled, as an excuse for the English Junker grip on Ireland. Lloyd George, Asquith, Balfour, and all the other English politicians regularly and periodically remind Ulster of this, its reason for existing. Ulster is, moreover, a garrison, a foreign garrison, now armed partly with English and American armament, partly with weapons graciously supplied by Krupp and the Kaiser before the war, in exchange for hard cash paid by the lords and gentlemen of England. It is the business of this garrison to help hold Ireland for the "superior race," for the authentic originals of Nietzsche's supermen.

A few of the names of the English patrons of this alien colony in the northeast corner of Ireland may be of interest. The late Duke of Norfolk, "leading Roman Catholic layman on this planet," according to some of his English friends, was a very mighty potentate indeed in the organization that collected and disbursed funds to help Carson fight the Pope. He contributed liberally to those funds. He stood beside Carson at Liverpool, at Birmingham, London and all over England, while Carson told the English people of the enormity of the iniquity of putting the Protestants of Ulster under a Home Rule Government that would represent a majority of Catholics. His Grace of Norfolk did not believe that Irishmen are unfit for self-government, nor did he think that their religion unfitted them for that task. He merely felt and acknowledged the foreboding that Home Rule for Ireland would be merely one step, but a tremendous step, in advance for real democracy in the British Isles. He and his class, the hereditary legislators, the lords and gentlemen of England, have little use for real democracy anywhere. In addition to this hatred of the

democratic principle, opposition to Home Rule was good political tactics on the part of the aristocratic party. In large sections of darkest England, the Protestant drum is a fine vote-getter. In some corners of England and Scotland, in fact, it works almost as well as it does in Florida and Georgia. So Norfolk, the Catholic, and Balfour, the Protestant, could count on coaxing away many sound Protestant English votes from the English Democratic party, by merely raising the cry that Home Rule is "Rome Rule."

In the eighties of the last century almost all the leaders of the Irish people were in jail at the behest of Mr. Gladstone, who jailed Parnell on the ground that "the resources of civilization against its enemies are not exhausted." Lord Salisbury and the other leaders of the Tory party then tried to "dish" Gladstone and the Liberals by making a deal with Parnell in jail. The Tories were to grant Home Rule while the Irish party was to vote with the Tories in the House of Commons. If that deal had gone through, then I have no doubt the Liberals would have become the champions of Ulster, the creators and upholders of the Rome Rule bogey. It is principally a matter of political tactics between the two English parties; the best men on each side, such as Morley for the Liberals and Wyndham for the Tories, have confessed that Ireland is little more than the shuttlecock of English party-politics.

Other eminent Tories who patronize Ulster are, or were, Lord Charles Beresford, Sir John Jellicoe, the late Lord Roberts, the late Earl Kitchener, Lord French, Sir William Gough, who let the Germans through at St. Quentin last March, after receiving his promotion as a reward for his services to Carson. With them were associated all the leading figures in London "society." Thus the English navy, the English army, and society were behind the Ulster sham. Society in London consists of two elements, first, the real blue blood that comes down from William the Conqueror, second, the rich brewers, bankers and pork butchers who buy titles and peerages and pedigrees for good coin of the realm. This second element corresponds to our "big-money" element, just as the first element corresponds to our New England and Virginia and New York aristocracy. When Lloyd George belonged to the Liberal or Democratic party and was fighting to free the Methodists and Baptists of his native Wales from the incubus of an established Episcopal Church, he gave to the nobility and gentry of England who supported and were supported by that incubus, the name of "the British Beerage," because the humble pewter beer-tankard provided most of the funds that paid for most of the titles and pedigrees of those exalted persons. That gentry has been the butt of English satirists from Swift to Meredith. The superstitious awe with which so many Englishmen look up to them invited the caustic wit of Thackeray.

These heterogeneous assemblages of privileged persons

instinctively resent anything that helps the toiler or the poor; they instinctively feel that to make the poor comfortable, to give them education, to give them political rights, is to endanger the citadel of privilege. That is the secret of their hatred of Ireland. That is the reason for the manufacture and the upkeep of Ulster. Ireland would quickly absorb and assimilate the alien colony in the northeast corner of Ulster, if the powerful alien sustenance and stimulus were withdrawn. A London Tory paper on the Ulster question is about as reliable as a Wall Street organ on an American labor problem, or an American profiteering scandal. The British Peerage keeps old sores open in Ulster and opens new ones by a most powerful and heavily financed propaganda. Right down to the middle of the war the English army and navy were the family property of the aristocracy. And it was this control of the army and navy that terrified King George and Lloyd George and Asquith into annulling the British Constitution by killing a Home Rule measure that had passed through all the constitutional stages three several times. Military rule in the strictest sense annulled and suspended the British Constitution in the case of Home Rule, merely because Home Rule threatened the interests and defied the Junker prejudices of the privileged class that owned the army and navy.

English democrats are familiar with this glaring fact. They all know that Ireland realizes that Ulster is a mere pretense, an excuse manufactured to throw a rag of democratic decency over the naked Junkerism of the English aristocracy. And those English democrats fear that Lloyd George will prove to be too weak a dilution of democracy in the new Junker Government. Hitherto the lords and gentlemen of England of inherited or purchased pedigree have felt it safe to perform the experiment of saber-rattling government in the Irish body politic. They have not felt it quite safe to use army, navy, finance, and society against the vital interests of the English people, at all events since the Chartist movement of the thirties of the last century. But now they have a big majority in the new English Parliament, mainly due to Lloyd George's war record and his radical social program. English Democrats fear that the lords and gentlemen with or without the cooperation of Lloyd George, will try to revive their ancient privilege of ruling by saber and bullet in England as well as in Ireland. The rule of the saber and the bullet in England is the ultimate aim and the logical consequence of the scheme of the schemers who manufactured and sustained and who work the Ulster sham and bogey. And this is the reason why the Chestertons, the Wellses, the Massinghams, the Morleys, the Burnses and all the thinking Democrats of England hate the very name of Ulster. For Ulster suggests to them the horrors of privilege and caste from which England tried to free herself by revolution after revolution.

Let nobody blame Ulster. Inanimate puppets are not

responsible. Let the blame fall on the wily tricksters who manufactured the puppet and pull the strings, and they are the Junkers of England. Part of the Junker plan is to direct attention to the antics of their Belfast puppet and then talk about Irish disunion. This patent fraud seems to deceive some well-meaning persons in America. "No Popery," yells the Belfast gramophone. "Irish dissension," say the American dupes of the London operator of the gramophone.

On the Road to Unity

DANIEL A. LORD, S. J.

THE briefest study of the proposed American Church brings us face to face with its fundamental ideal, the unity of all religious bodies and of all American citizens in one great Church. Its propagators are striving to fulfill the desire of Christ that there be but one Fold.

The Catholic will find it hard to understand how Protestants—and the leading propagators of the new Church are Protestants—can fail to see that the new ideal is a frank admission that for four centuries Protestantism has labored in vain. The chaos and discord of the sects is not mere accident. It is the logical, inevitable working out of the fundamental Protestant principle, the right of the individual to interpret religious creeds and religious experiences for himself. Protestantism was established with this as a basic principle; it has fought valiantly for that principle during the course of its existence. The result has been the pitiful division of Protestantism first into sects, then into reformed sects, and finally into reformed, reformed sects, and a loose jointure among the members of the single sects, who float with casual unconcern from one Church to another. Now, at the end of four centuries, Protestantism finds that it must, if it desires to be effective, return to the unity which it so scathingly repudiated when it broke away from the center of union.

During those centuries when the principle of private interpretation was cutting Protestantism into smaller and smaller segments, the sects kept drifting ever farther apart. They agreed in one thing, their repudiation of Catholicism, the only abiding principle of religious unity; they disagreed on almost every conceivable point of doctrine and practice. It is, consequently, no small task at this late day to bring some sort of unity out of Churches which have little common in belief, worship, or form of government. Prescinding altogether from the difficulties of uniting Catholicism with Protestantism, or the still greater difficulties that arise when they dream of religious unity that will unite believers and unbelievers, men of any tincture of creed whatsoever, they will find that the mere task of bringing unity out of the thousand and one Protestant creeds is something to tax the most sanguine dreamer of dreams.

Disunion among the sects does not begin and end in the fact that their members occupy different buildings

and listen to different ministers on Sunday. It involves questions of belief and methods of worship which, whether they trace back their origin to the days of the catacombs or are a thing of yesternight's sproutage, are still bone and blood of the sect that teaches them.

Before, then, there can be any thought of unity even among Protestants, the fathers of the new Church must be ready to usher in the Presbyterian with his relentless creed of predestination and the Episcopalian who holds predestination in abhorrence; the Unitarian who rejects the Trinity and the Methodist who still builds Trinity churches. In kaleidoscopic succession the pulpits of the new Church must be held by ministers who hold the Divinity of Christ with all the tremendous consequences of that belief and by ministers who believe Christ merely the highest type of man. Protestant Episcopal incense and vestment must be made to blend with Presbyterian rigorous simplicity. Baptism must be an essential or an accidental of the new Church, a sacrament for children or one for adults depending entirely on what the individual chooses to hold.

There is only one other alternative: each sect must be asked to give up its individual beliefs and forms of worship and merge itself in a common belief and practice. The choice is clear; either the sects must be united in such a way as to preserve what for centuries they have cherished, or a scheme must be found of persuading them to lay aside their beliefs, to accept the creed which will be laid down as essential to the new American Church. Here would seem to be a difficulty that ought to terrify the most optimistic.

The difficulty is not, however, to the fathers of the new American Church, nearly so insurmountable as it would appear. The very first characteristic of the new Church is built up to meet and solve precisely this difficulty. Dr. Everett A. Miller, writing in the *Zion Herald* to plead for unity, waives this aside as no real difficulty at all.

"Denominational differences," he declares, "are only epidermic; our roots are all set in the same soil. To allow forms and ceremonies, traditions and politics, to keep Christians asunder is a colossal blunder."

The attitude here struck is typical of the propagators of the new unity. At heart, all Christian sects are the same; disunion is all on the surface. Our American Church will include only the essentials, leaving what is non-essential to individual interpretation. Thus by a single stroke of the pen, do we attain to unity without losing the individuality dear to the sects.

If the difficulty were as palpably easy as Dr. Miller and his confreres imply, the vain efforts time out of mind to unite even small religious bodies would be quite inexplicable. But his statement on closer examination proves to be mere misty platitude without foundation in anything more solid than an irresponsible good-will and an incurable idealism.

"Denominational differences are only epidermic." Skin diseases, it might be noted in passing, are among the few

non-fatal maladies that continue to baffle the medical world. A surgeon who, with scarcely an effort, will cure a ruptured appendix or remove troublesome gall-stones, stands helplessly before a growing youth's pimply skin.

But just how much on the surface are these differences between the sects? If every shade of doctrine, every religious variant possible, is not taught by Protestant Churches, then the general public has been vastly misled. One may be a Protestant and believe in personal merit or reject it, accept the Providence of God or question it, defend the authenticity and infallibility of the Scriptures or class them as myth, poetry, history, or lies. Why, it is even possible for a Protestant seminarian to step from a psychology classroom at Harvard, where they teach him there are no such things as individual souls and immortality straight into a pulpit erected for the salvation of individual, immortal spirits. One wonders with Marshall, after even a brief acquaintance with modern Protestant thought, whether it would be considered heresy nowadays for a minister to question the existence of God.

The only way to speak of these differences as epidermic is by admitting that the Protestant sects are singularly thick-skinned. The fact is, however, that they strike deep down into the very roots in such a way as to affect inevitably the whole course of life of one who has not come to separate belief from practice. A man who be-

lieves in personal responsibility for sin cannot logically follow the same path as one who holds that he is predestined to heaven or to hell. The man who accepts the Bible as God's inspired Word must act in accord with the law it contains; the man who rejects its inspiration is no more influenced by it than he would be by Epictetus or Macbeth or Sartor Resartus.

Differences like these, and I have barely touched the octaves from lowest bass to highest treble of Protestant belief, are not to be swept away by the legerdemain of an optimistic smile and plausible words. Far less is the Catholic to be persuaded that the doctrines of his Church are after all non-essential and of trifling import. Unity is precious, but not nearly so precious in the eyes of a right-thinking man as truth. And if, to attain an untied, doubtful unity, he must now treat what he holds to be essential truth as accidental and of slight moment, he is more than likely to hesitate long before entering the new American Church.

At best, the new American Church can leave each of the churches its own individual doctrines, while as a Church it teaches absolutely nothing on any of what Dr. Miller has called accidental, epidermic dogmas. To obtain even a sort of unity, it must confine its teaching strictly to what Protestants call essentials in belief. It may be interesting in my next paper to notice just what is essential in the belief to be held by the new American Church.

Labor's Program of Reconstruction

JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

THE Committee on Reconstruction, appointed by the American Federation of Labor at its annual meeting last July, has published its report. The document is quite long, occupying almost a page of fine print in one of the metropolitan newspapers. On the whole, it is neither conservative nor radical, although it contains some statements and some omissions which make parts of it open to each of these characterizations. Compared with the much-discussed program of the British Labor Congress, entitled "Labor and the New Social Order," it is practical, partial, unsystematic, and unphilosophical. But these differences were to be expected. Both documents exhibit the viewpoint and the limitations of their respective authors. The British program was written by the Fabian Socialist, Sidney Webb; the American program was drawn up by men who adhere to the moderate policy of trade unionism.

The demands and recommendations of the American labor program can all be roughly grouped under the two heads, trade union action and legislative action. The latter heading might be subdivided into immediate proposals and remote proposals, but no formal recognition of such a division will be necessary in a discussion that will be confined to two short articles.

The first topic presented in the program is "democ-

racy in industry." While this occupies seven paragraphs, and includes several rather important general statements, such as, "the workers should have a voice in determining the laws within industry and commerce which affect them," the concrete conclusion to which it points is rather feeble and platitudinous: the right, legally guaranteed, of the workers to organize and to carry on the legitimate activities of trade unions. This demand is no longer denied, except by a rapidly diminishing group of reactionary employers. Perhaps the latter are still sufficiently important to render advisable a restatement of the reasonable position on this subject; but "democracy in industry" surely means more than labor's freedom to organize. It means, at the least, that labor should have a greater control than in the past over the productive processes of industry. If the authors of the program admit, as they probably do, this principle they should have made some attempt to describe it in specific terms. We have been surfeited with talk about "democracy in industry," and we know that to many the phrase spells Socialism. Those who are not Socialists and yet demand "democracy in industry" are under a particular obligation to tell us exactly what they mean.

The program declares that unemployment is due to under-consumption, which is in turn the result of low

wages, and that the obvious remedy is high wages. While there is a considerable amount of truth in this argument, the situation is not quite so simple as here represented. There are other causes of unemployment than under-consumption of goods, and high wages, though important as a preventive, are not always sufficient as a remedy. When a nation's supply of capital is relatively low, too large a proportion of the high wages may be immediately spent, and too little saved. If wages were lower and prices lower, the business classes and the consumers who are not wage earners in the ordinary sense would be able to save more, and their savings might exceed the savings made by the laboring class of high wages. Thus more money would be available for the creation of new and necessary capital goods, such as machinery and buildings. However, it is probable that at any given time, as the present, the continuation of high wages is a better social policy than wage reductions. Therefore, the labor unions should be supported in their determination and resist reductions in the present scale of wages.

From the proposition that high wages are vitally necessary to industry the authors of the program draw the inference that labor organization is equally necessary. "There is no means whereby the workers can obtain and maintain fair wages except through trade union effort." This assertion is flatly contradicted by the increases in wages which have been obtained by thousands upon thousands of women and minors through the operation of minimum wage laws in half a dozen of our States. These advances would not have been brought about by "trade union effort," for the simple reason that these classes of workers could not have been effectively organized. In Australasia and Great Britain, the wages of men, as well as of women and minors, have likewise been raised by legislation when organization would have failed. To assert, as the leaders of the American Federation of Labor constantly do, that if women workers and unskilled male workers would only form unions, they could get all the advances in remuneration that result from minimum wage legislation, is not only futile but cruel. The vital fact is that these two classes are practically incapable of effective and general organization. After more than a quarter of a century of activity, the American Federation of Labor includes only about fifteen per cent of the "organizable" section of the wage earners, and only a negligible portion of the unskilled. Despite all its efforts to bring this latter class into the unionism the Federation embraces no larger a proportion of them today than fifteen years ago. This is perhaps the most serious indictment that can be drawn against the American Federation of Labor as a custodian of the interests of the laboring class: it does not seem to realize its obligations and its limitations with regard to those workers who are least able to help themselves. Instead of recognizing frankly the fully established facts of experience, that organization cannot within a reasonable period of time become an effective method of raising to decent levels

the wages of the unskilled, and that the only adequate means is legal action, the leaders of the Federation continue to oppose, at least as regards adult male workers, minimum wage legislation, and to repeat the old discredited formula about the sufficiency of "trade union effort." If certain groups of the unskilled have formed anarchistic organizations, such as the I. W. W., the blame rests largely upon the shoulders of the Federation leaders, who have not been sufficiently progressive or sufficiently altruistic to see that they ought to advocate legal action on behalf of that great section of the workers whom they have been unable to assist adequately by organization. They do not show a proper realization of their industrial and social responsibility.

One of the most positive of the declarations in the program is the following: "The right of labor to fix its hours of work must not be abrogated, abridged or interfered with." Taken as they stand, these words demand that labor be permitted to determine the length of the working day independently of the wishes of the employer. The theory seems to be that the laborer should have the same unconditioned freedom to determine how long he will work as the capitalist has to determine where he will place his investments. The parallel is not exact. The proper comparison is between the laborer's right to work or not to work and the capitalist's right to invest his money here or there. The length of the working day is a matter that affects the employer quite as definitely as the employee. There is no more reason why the worker should independently fix his hours of labor than his wages. The claim set up in this proposition of the program is exactly parallel to that of those autocratic employers who insist upon "running their own business" without consulting their employees. The two pretensions are equally indefensible, and for the same fundamental reason: each ignores the right of the other party to participate in fixing conditions of the contract that affects the other's welfare.

In view of the claim frequently advanced by trade union leaders that labor does not get the full value of its contribution to the product, or does not get all that it ought to get, the failure of the program to draw up a systematic statement or theory of labor's just share, is regrettable. "A living wage for all wage earners, skilled or unskilled," is the only statement given us in the program. While this demand is obviously just, it is only the minimum of justice. We may, indeed, feel quite certain that the authors of the program did not intend to define this as the maximum to which labor is entitled, but we cannot help regretting that they did not issue a more comprehensive statement.

The only other important ethical proposition of the program in the matter of wages is that, "women should receive the same pay as men." On the whole, this is an equitable and an industrially sound principle, but its practical implications are not all as simple as the terms in which it is stated. In practice, either the male or the

female living standard is often taken as the basis of comparison. In the former case, the males will receive insufficient wages; in the latter case, it is frequently found that the females are not really as efficient as the males, and will not be continued in employment if the rule of equal pay is enforced. Where wages are fixed without any conscious reference to the standard of living, but somewhat above the minimum standard, very few women seem to be able to hold their places in competition with men at the same wages. In general, whether the prevailing standards be high or low, women seem to drive men out of certain occupations, and to monopolize these at a lower level of remuneration. Their lower cost of living becomes the main determinant of wages. Nevertheless, the male unionists are right in insisting upon the rule of equal pay for equal work. If women can compete for occupations with men at men's wages no harm is done to either. If they cannot retain their places on this basis they should move into some other occupation rather than bring down the wages of all to a lower level.

Taken as a whole, the first part of labor's program of reconstruction exhibits the well known virtues and defects of trade union theory in the United States. It contains no important new development of principle.

Several paragraphs of the program are occupied with a defence of the Federation's long-established policy of refusing to form or countenance the formation of a labor party in politics. It is contended that all efforts of this sort by union labor in America have been costly failures, and that the method of endorsing the friends and condemning the foes of labor on the old party tickets, has secured more benefits for the working class than have been obtained by "the workers of any other country." The first of these statements is historically true; the second is, to say the least, not proved. The political labor party has certain important advantages to which the authors of the program make no reference: it enables all voters to know just who are the candidates that have a right to represent the views and aims of organized labor; it brings a greater proportion of union men to the support of friendly candidates than does the method of picking out such candidates on the tickets of other parties; and it makes necessary the selection of candidates by the whole body of union members, instead of, as is now the usual case, by the officers alone.

The Knights and the A. E. F.

JOHN B. KENNEDY

THERE are many who remark that the Knights of Columbus, in their really monumental war work, have not received the publicity they merit. Examine this statement, and it will be found that it is about the best and most epigrammatic piece of publicity that the Knights could receive, for it means that the K. C. disregarding the prescription of efficient young men, have let their advertising follow their deeds; they have gone into the battle of endeavor with arms foremost, and trumpets, drums and the paraphernalia of boom following in the rear. That is

not altogether a comfortable or otherwise advantageous position for the blowers of the trumpets and the bangers of the drums, but better thus; at least so the K. C. would have it.

If you visit the camp and battle sectors of the French front for the purpose of gaging the value of the war-relief organizations to the troops who won the war—and I am sure that many enterprising newspapermen are engaged in this pilgrimage—you will not have been long on the field before you come to the realization that the Knights of Columbus stand, as the picturesque and often picaresque phrase has it, ace-high with the innumerable members of the American Expeditionary Forces you will meet in your wanderings.

Particularly is this the case with men belonging to divisions who have seen hard and fast and furious fighting, such divisions as the Forty-second, the Twenty-sixth, the Twenty-seventh, the brawny lads of the Sunset Division. Meet men with the symbols of these outfits on their left shoulders and they will tell you with convincing tongues that the Knights were with them in the last terrible battles of the war, when the great prize of victory was really at stake, when, if the Germans had been faced with men uncomfited by the little physical luxuries that brace the soul, a different story might have been told and the glorious record of Belleau Wood, Chateau Thierry and the Argonne might yet be waiting accomplishment.

From the very first, the K. C. men went where they were needed most, to the front line. Father John B. de Valles and Father Osias Boucher, two sturdy priests who were among the pioneers in K. C. overseas work, were decorated with the *Croix de Guerre* for bravery displayed in what was probably their baptism of fire. Secretary Kelly, hailing from Salt Lake City, received the same honor and there are several K. C. men bearing on their right arms the golden chevron that indicates the most tangible testimony of service under fire, while scores of them carry in their hearts the wounds of the scenes of horror and destruction they have witnessed.

In those feverish days when the war was whirling apparently in the enemy's favor, when none of the news was hopeful, and it seemed as if the embattled democracies might be stampeded into swift military defeat, time was the paramount consideration in all things. The K. C. growing in financial and personnel strength for war-relief work, as the weeks progressed, had both to do and develop. The surprising thing is that their affairs were so well managed executively at home that in all the rush and turmoil, in what might almost literally be called the scramble to keep up with the swift and varying movements of the battles, the definite object of reaching and relieving our fighting men was always kept clearly in view above all obstacles that intervened.

What seemed like a hopeless formalism of worker's cards and movement-orders, of special permits for cars—those with pneumatic tires being solidly and seriously differentiated, in the provost marshal's office, from those with hard tires—assigned the incoming war workers filled with enthusiasm for their jobs, to the place where those jobs awaited them. Of course, the utmost precaution was necessary, for the enemy had an unpleasant subtlety of disguise. Without the most rigid surveillance it was highly probable that suave gentlemen with hard g's and chronic k's might be found, and they were always ultimately discovered, serving the Fatherland in any kind of a uniform adopted by the United States and its associates. Yet, it is a fact that the close supervision exercised in the United States, the source of the supply of K. C. secretaries, should have been given greater credit. In contradiction of this the story is told of the clever German spy who got through the tangles of French red tape and boarded the Rochambeau as a passenger at Bordeaux. This was during the height of the submarine season; but the French boat went unmolested to New York, where the spy was apprehended and subsequently disposed

of. But this contradiction is disposed of easily, the spy's destination was just as interesting to the authorities as his place of origin; his whither held quite as much significance as his whence.

Despite all the delays, and the irritating slowness of the good ships that zigzagged across the ocean with their cargoes of relief articles, the K. C. workers reached the front with all possible speed. The railroads of France were choked with the actual strength of the battle, fighting men and the things with which they fought. It was almost impossible to secure even the smallest amount of space in a freight car when soldiers and shells were jammed in by scores. Gasoline had to be relied upon, and it was a common sight to see muddy motor trucks laden with K. C. supplies, starting out from the K. C. warehouse in the Rue Malherbes, Paris, at all hours of the night, dashing out of Paris, on through Meaux past one of the glorious cathedrals of old France, and thence creeping through the environs of the battle areas, to hide in some little wood where the secretaries attached to a division could unload the trucks, strap the bundles to their backs, and tramp back to the front to bring cheer to our fighting men who were in sore need of it.

More than one epic might be written of the mother wit employed to get the stuff to the boys, and I think that many a grey-haired man really learned to attach something of sacredness to so commonplace a luxury as chocolate when he saw the dumb rapture with which wounded lads accepted the sweets in their hour of agony. And our good clubmen who debate the comparative attractions of different issues of liberty bonds, throwing away inches of imported cigars the while, would have a new sense of the holiness of tobacco rightly used, if they could have seen, as many K. C. secretaries saw, what a sedative an inexpensive cigarette was to a troubled soul in a tortured body.

Epic after epic might be written of the struggles made by K. C. men to pilot their roller-kitchens to strategic points where they might be of utmost use to boys entering the trenches and returning from them. And to illustrate the K. C. instinct for doing the deed before publishing it there is the story, an absolutely authentic one, of how a K. C. kitchen was the first haven for the boys of the famed Lost Battalion when they emerged, torn and triumphant from the pocket in the Argonne forest that had witnessed one of the bitterest little sieges of the entire world war.

When Father John B. de Valles, a K. C. chaplain, spent hours of the night crawling through No Man's Land to find a wounded non-Catholic Connecticut lad, when Joseph Crowe had a leg blown off in his attempt to get supplies to a certain battalion, when Jack Stewart was gassed while on his way to succor a wounded boy, when a score of similarly brave deeds were done, the record of the Knights was written on the hearts of all our fighting men who saw or heard of these things.

The Knights have rendered first aid, they have comforted the sick and brought the consolations of religion to the dying. They have done everything that red blooded men can do in emergencies when life was much cheaper than the means to sustain it. They have eschewed all petty distinctions that are dear to hearts of small men even in great crises; they have gone up into the line with privates as privates. They have been men among men, worthy representatives of an Order whose first principles are the natural principles of true manhood. And the best tribute that can be paid is one from a newspaper man who spent nineteen months at the front and knows the full story of those who have done things and those who have not. C. C. Lyon, war correspondent of the Newspaper Enterprise Association of Cleveland, Ohio, has this to say: "The Knights of Columbus secretaries have always impressed me as being able and eager to do their jobs. I didn't know much about the Knights before I went to Europe; but now nobody will ever be able to convince me of anything but good about them."

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words

The Czechs and Slovaks

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Much is being written about the Czechs, the Slovaks, and their new-founded republic. Into this periodical writing on a popular subject inaccuracies will creep. Thus Dr. Austin O'Malley in his article, "Vienna a Generation Ago" (*AMERICA*, January 4), makes this statement: "Blessed Clement Mary Hofbauer, the first German Redemptorist, etc." (Italics inserted). This happens to be a popular though totally erroneous notion. Here is, to quote but one authority, what Rev. John Magnier, C. SS. R., of Rome, has to say about this in the "Catholic Encyclopedia" (Vol. IV, p. 44b):

Clement Mary Hofbauer (John Dvorák), Blessed, the second founder of the Redemptorist Congregation, called the "Apostle of Vienna," b. at Tasswitz in Moravia, 26 December, 1751; d. at Vienna, 15 March, 1821. The family name of Dvorák was better known by its German equivalent, Hofbauer.

To this I may add that the reason why the Blessed Clement changed his name was an apostolic one; the hatred against the Czechs at Vienna in those days of German usurpation would have been too great an obstacle to his missionary labors.

Another instance of an inaccuracy occurs in the January and February issues of the *Catholic World*. In the section "Recent Events," the following statement is made:

The new Government (The Czecho-Slovak National Assembly) with a reckless disregard of the principle upon which it based its right to existence, has given notice to all concerned that it will not allow the Germans who are the dominating factor in *two-fifths of the territory* of the Republic to decide for themselves whether or not they shall join the New Germany. (Italics inserted.)

In the first place, I wish to observe that the only regions in which there is a considerable German element are those parts of the Republic adjoining Bavaria on the west, Saxony on the east, and Hungary on the south. Now, even in those regions where the German nationality is numerically dominant, there is always a very strong Czech minority, and these, be it remembered, *are in their own land*, theirs from somewhere in the first half of the seventh century. Here let me add the testimony of such an authority as Dr. Charles D. Hazen, professor of history of Columbia (I quote his article in the *New York Times*, under date of August 18, 1918, as republished in pamphlet form):

The area of the Czech countries is approximately 30,000 square miles, and of the Slovak regions about 18,000. According to the census of 1910, there were about 6,500,000 Czechs and 2,000,000 Slovaks, but these figures were underestimated for political purposes, and nationalist leaders say that there are about 8,000,000 Czechs and 3,000,000 Slovaks. Among them live some 3,000,000 Germans and several hundred thousand Magyars, and the program of the independence movement provides for *complete cultural autonomy for these national minorities*. (Italics inserted.)

From the above it can be seen that there are really only *three-fourteenths* of Germans in the whole of the Czecho-Slovak Republic. These, moreover, are promised cultural autonomy. This last point ought to be borne in mind when it is remembered how the Germans and Magyars, whilst for more than 300 years in control of the government, made supreme, but, thank God, futile attempts, to suppress all cultural progress of the Czech peoples.

You will allow me, in interest of the timeliness of the topic, to add another quotation from the same source as the above, but written by Walter Littlefield:

The attention of the world has lately [written last August] been arrested and greatly stirred by the achievements in Siberia and Russia of the Czecho-Slovaks, perhaps the most romantic story that the war has yet produced. . . . And when we know more about the Czecho-Slovaks we shall find

that this singular, unique manifestation of clear thinking, of imagination, of daring, under confused and bewildering conditions, is the revelation to the world of a mature, self-controlled, high-spirited, thoughtful people which has passed through a long and bitter experience of adversity, and of humiliating and dangerous subjection to an alien and hateful rule, and which has learned its lessons in the hard school of misfortune and misery. We have not to do with a mere band of adventurers enjoying freakishly good luck and enacting a sensational part, thanks to wanton chance and brazen nerve, but with a people virile, resourceful, and resolute, ripe for independence, and worthy of it, a people which has prepared itself for the morrow by taking thought of the morrow. . . . They were the only people in Christendom, as far as I know, who solemnly and indignantly protested against the rape of Alsace-Lorraine by Germany. And the reason that they then gave showed their possession of a clear understanding of the significance of that act, all the more noteworthy inasmuch as other governments passed by on the other side. . . . A part of this noble document, as given by Professor Benes of the Czech University of Prague, reads as follows:

The Czech nation cannot but express its most ardent sympathy with noble and glorious France, which today is defending its independence and national soil, which has accomplished so much for the advancement of civilization and the principles of humanity and liberty. The Czech nation is convinced that such a humiliation as the tearing of a strip of territory from a nation so illustrious and heroic, so full of just national pride, will become a source of unending wars, and therefore of unending injuries to humanity and civilization. (Italics inserted). The Czechs are a small people, but their spirit and their courage are not small. They would be ashamed by their silence to let the world believe that they approve of this injustice, or that they dare not make their protest against it because of its underlying power.

As a final word I wish to add that two American priests, Mgr. Emil Bouska and Rev. Oldrich Zlamal, have been invited by the Czech National Assembly to come to Prague to help settle that delicate question of the separation of the Church and the State. Let us hope that the Czech leaders will show themselves as intelligent, just, and far-sighted in this as they have in all those hard problems that have been devolving upon them in these arduous times.

Chicago.

AUGUSTINE STUDENY, O. S. B.

Street Preaching

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"Is auto-street-park preaching to be encouraged by pastors?" asks A. S. of Providence. (AMERICA for February 1, 1919). Being laymen we cannot assume to answer for pastors. Yet considering the local and national endorsements our autovan work has received we are constrained to reply it is. From ocean to ocean generous endorsements have been received from twenty-two of our foremost churchmen, beginning with Cardinal O'Connell in good old St. Botolph's "towne" and reaching across the continent to the city of St. Francis, where Archbishop Hanna gave our "street-park-preaching" a most hearty welcome and God bless you en route home. Our experience wholly warrants the conclusion that the open air address in the interest of Catholic truth is to be encouraged by priests, because it has been so greatly encouraged and has been so successful—we have been asked on several occasions to return with our autovan for a seven days' open air mission.

If perchance A. S. is in doubt because of the quotation from Leo XIII, which he cited, we are confident that his doubt will be expelled upon reading further from His Holiness. Yet, from the quotation used by A. S. the obligation is to recognize the true foundation for the work of the laity: "The faithful will fulfill their duty by integrity of life, work of Christian charity, instant and assiduous prayer." Surely all Catholics worthy of the name will assent. There are, however, no restrictions here laid down.

Again the quotation A. S. cites insists that those who labor for the Church shall "work by the authority of the Bishops."

It were rebellious to dissent from this. So it is that the Catholic Truth Guild has ever adhered to this requirement. We never hold an open air meeting within a diocese without first receiving the permission of the Bishop and then the approval of the local pastor.

However, it were well to recall in this connection that it was the expressed hope of Pope Leo XIII that those laymen who have the ambition and the ability should communicate to others those principles and practices which by God's grace they have been privileged to understand—not, indeed, by taking upon themselves the office of the priest but rather by co-operating in "spreading abroad the light of undefiled faith." We submit that street-park-addresses may spread abroad the light of undefiled faith.

Yet if decision is to rest upon the words of Pope Leo, whether or not laymen's auto van speaking is to be encouraged—it is hoped that the Encyclical on the "Duties of Christians as Citizens" written one year later than the citation A. S. presented will be permitted to lay the foundation for judgment. We quote:

Since then faith is necessary for salvation, it follows that the word of Christ must be preached. The office indeed of preaching, that is of teaching, lies by Divine right in the province of the pastors, namely of the Bishops whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God. It belongs above all to the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ, established as head of the universal Church, teacher of all that pertains to morals and faith. No one, however, must entertain the notion that private individuals are prevented from taking some active part in this duty of teaching, especially those on whom God has bestowed the gifts of mind with the strong wish of rendering themselves useful. These, so often as circumstances demand, may take upon themselves, not indeed the office of the pastor, but the task of communicating to others what they themselves have received, becoming, as it were, living echoes of their masters in the Faith. Such co-operation on the part of the laity has seemed to the Fathers of the Vatican Council so opportune and fruitful of good that they thought well to invite it. All faithful Christians, but those chiefly who are in a prominent position, or engaged in teaching, we entreat, by the compassion of Jesus Christ, and enjoin by the authority of the same God and Saviour, that they bring aid to ward off and eliminate these errors from Holy Church, and contribute their zealous help in spreading abroad the light of undefiled faith. Let each one therefore bear in mind that he both can and should, so far as may be, preach the Catholic faith by the authority of his example, and by open and constant profession of the obligations it imposes. In respect consequently to the duties that bind us to God and the Church, it should be borne earnestly in mind that in propagating Christian truth and warding off errors, the zeal of the laity should, as far as possible, be brought actively into play.

This will, no doubt, encourage the zealous.

Boston.

DAVID GOLDSTEIN.

After-the-War Biology

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Alas, for the preciousness of space in AMERICA, and no one is gladder than I that it is so precious, and that the readers have such an interesting variety every week. I had both of the passages which the Rev. Dr. Hickey of Villanova selects commented on in the manuscript, but the comments had to be pruned to save the editor that task. I hope that he and your readers will note that I said Professor Conklin's conclusions are "of the very essence of conservatism" and not that they are the essence of conservatism. That little word implies an approximation or perhaps a participation, but not a totality.

I hope some time soon to have the opportunity to comment in your columns on Professor Conklin's expression that "there has been extinction of the world's most gifted lines by enforced celibacy in many Religious Orders and societies of scholars." I think that it can be shown that celibacy actually added to the world's power and energy, rather than diminished them. That

cannot be done in a paragraph or two, however. I thank Rev. Dr. Hickey for giving me the chance to awaken readers' and editors' curiosity as to that subject.

New York.

JAS. J. WALSH, M. D.

Let Us Play Fair

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In answer to Mr. Atkins' latest communication let me say that I regret to see that he has so soon deserted in practice his self-selected standard, "Let Us Play Fair," and has gone over to the camp of the shifting argument. In endeavoring to cloud the issue he is *not* playing according to the golden rule. It is all very well for Mr. Atkins to pass over my argument with a general denial, to say that my whole argument is based on an erroneous assumption, but not one word, not one argument does he bring forward to prove this assertion. He cannot, and hence does not, attempt to refute my "undeniable facts." He neglects my arguments in support of the K. of C.'s plan of action; and instead of accusing the K. of C., as in his previous letter, of unfairness in giving their benefits free of charge, he accuses them of unfairness because they did not minister to all the boys. Thus by deserting his former position he admits its untenableness, and now chameleon-like he changes his argument.

Now let me follow Mr. Atkins into his new position. He asserts that the K. of C. gave to some boys and not to all, and that this is unfair. In answer it may be said that the K. of C. gave freely and liberally to every American boy with whom they came in contact, and if all did not benefit by their generosity, it was only because the K. of C. being a human institution, were necessarily limited in possibilities, and hence could not reach all, much to their regret. True it is that there were "soldiers in France and elsewhere" who did not receive the K. of C. benefits. But what has this to do with the original argument? We are dealing with human organizations. Were all the other organizations working wherever American soldiers were operating? Mr. Atkins is hedging on the main point at issue and hence his method of arguing is necessarily obscure and misleading.

Moreover in your correspondent's letter there is a very subtle insinuation when he says that "some" and not "all" our boys benefited by the fund, namely, that some discrimination was manifested in the distribution of the benefits "bought with the financial aid which the K. of C. received from persons of all creeds." If the K. of C., receiving contributions "from persons of all creeds," did not give freely, without discrimination, to "our boys of all creeds," then there would be some foundation for his statement, but I challenge Mr. Atkins to cite any instance where one of our boys was discriminated against by the K. of C. because of creed. No such a thing has occurred. Again Mr. Atkins in another paragraph of one of his letters admits the falsity of his imputation for he accuses the K. of C. of using their everything free policy as a means of proselyting. Proselyting means "to induce persons to join a certain form of religion."

If the K. of C., as Mr. Atkins asserts, gave freely for the purpose of proselyting they must have given freely to persons of all creeds. Hence, by his own words he refutes his own argument. He is at cross purposes with himself.

"The money was to be used to supply additional chaplains, to erect and maintain huts and to provide entertainment for the boys." It affords me keen pleasure to assure your correspondent that this is precisely what was done with the money, the K. of C. fulfilled their trust nobly, and never did they charge "the soldiers and sailors" for any one of these things, neither for the use of the huts nor for the entertainment. What more pleasurable entertainment can be supplied to our boys than "the movies, the hot chocolate, and the smokes" of which the

K. of C. gave liberally and without charge to all with whom they were humanly speaking able to come in contact? And yet Mr. Atkins admits that this was one of the legitimate purposes for which the money was collected, the entertainment of our boys. If the fund is used for these legitimate purposes by the K. of C. there can be no unfairness, no injustice done by this policy to other organizations.

Let me go back now to the original point at issue; all the organizations "were trustees of a public fund raised for the benefit of the nation's defenders," "were agents for distributing the benefits purchased by money contributed to the war fund by the generous Americans of all denominations." No agent, no trustee, can use a public fund for any purpose other than the original one for which said fund was founded. No agent, no trustee, can use the said public fund for his own aggrandizement. He may demand legitimate expenses, but those must be within reason. He must see to it that the public fund is administered in the most advantageous manner in keeping with the original purpose. The K. of C., acting in the capacity of trustee, of agent, of the aforementioned public fund, found it possible to distribute liberally and without charge, the benefits purchased by the money of that public fund. Where is the injustice? Where is the unfairness? The funds were contributed to the various organizations, not for themselves, but, according to Mr. Atkins' own words, "to carry on welfare work for our soldiers and sailors." The K. of C. did this, without charge, and with great personal sacrifice on the part of its officials. Why could not other organizations distribute without charge?

According to Mr. Atkins "other organizations found it wise and necessary to make a small (*sic*) charge for the articles furnished." In all fairness let us know the honest reason for this wisdom and this necessity; the K. of C. did not deem it either wise or necessary to charge, and yet their organization and service were inferior to none and superior to most. Why the difference? Here is the whole crux of the question.

Roxbury, Mass.

A. J. H.

The Carnegie Foundation

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I think it well for our Catholic educators to know something of the recent developments in regard to the policies of the Carnegie Foundation. We Catholics cannot forget that in beginning their work the directors of the Foundation openly insulted those who made religious teaching a part of education. Let us see how the directors have succeeded in winning the favor of other educators. J. McKeen Cattell, the editor of *School and Society*, sought an expression of opinion from educators throughout the country in regard to the new insurance plans of the Foundation. Six hundred and thirty-six opposed the plans while only the unlucky number thirteen favored them.

Here are some of the letters received by Mr. Cattell from American educators (See *School and Society*, January 4, 1919, page 14 sq.). Each letter is printed in a separate paragraph:

I no longer have any interest or confidence in the Foundation and have thought only of depending on commercial insurance companies.

One thing is clear, that the plans of the Carnegie Foundation are unsatisfactory and untrustworthy.

The American Association of University Professors should not wait another day to voice its radical dissent from the views of President Pritchett and his associates, and to repudiate the Foundation both as an organ of public charity and of educational influence.

I know the Carnegie Foundation has made an utter failure of the work entrusted to it and that it should be reorganized or go out of business.

In my opinion the Foundation has failed utterly to do that for which it was founded. I don't care to express any opinion as to the incompetence or dishonesty of those who have been managing it, but I can't see how they can escape one charge or the other.

I entirely agree with you that the Carnegie system was one which was fraught with the greatest danger to freedom of thought and the development of the social sciences. I am glad that it was so poorly planned that its failure is assured.

The parallel with the German situation is obvious. But I suspect that the Kaiser will surrender before Pritchett. There is less excuse for the latter to hang on.

So far as actually losing money is concerned, I presume the Carnegie Foundation has escaped; but why a concern so conspicuously ill-managed, as regards the main purpose for which it was publicly declared to be founded, should expect to command the confidence and respect of trustees and faculties of American colleges, I cannot see. Its "scraps of paper" are vanderlipped away in a manner *first* understood in Prussia.

What I think we ought to do is to utterly ignore the Carnegie Foundation, and all its works. Moreover we should make it clear that we do so because it has brazenly disregarded all its promises, and because its only apparent *raison d'être* is to exercise an external, non-academic control over the souls of American university teachers.

When we remember that these are only a few of the letters received by the editor of *School and Society*, the attitude of the teaching profession towards the policies of the Carnegie Foundation and its directors no longer remains in doubt. Long ago Father Timothy Brosnahan, S. J., and other Catholic educators pointed out the lurking dangers and evil tendencies of the Foundation; and this at a time when secular and many non-Catholic institutions were bartering their birth-rights for the Carnegie mess of pottage. Now all educators have come to agree that the Carnegie morsel is poisonous.

Cincinnati.

H. S.

Catholic Students at Catholic Colleges

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I fear Mr. Cannon did not read my letter closely or he would have seen that I mentioned the Jesuit College at Worcester. Outside of New England, Holy Cross is not always synonymous with the Worcester college. Besides, I had just quoted Dr. Burns of Holy Cross College, Washington, and wished to be clear.

I was not quoting the New York figures with pride, and I made a mistake in the percentage, which should be 50 instead of 100. I think Mr. Cannon will find it is not correct to say that the numbers in our Worcester college "are built up largely from students far removed from Worcester." Here are the exact figures in 1900: Massachusetts, 164; New England, outside of Massachusetts, 63; New York, 41; Pennsylvania, 31; all other sources, 10. In 1916, Massachusetts, 368; New England, outside of Massachusetts, 120; New York, 62; Pennsylvania, 18; all other sources, 26. Connecticut is the largest contributor after Massachusetts. Mr. Cannon should remember, too, that the Worcester college of the Jesuits has had practically no competitors and the New York colleges have several.

In reply to F. X. M., I would admit that there are other factors besides Catholic population, financial condition, proximity of schools and number of competitors, but I hold that these are the chief factors. I heartily agree with him in saying that Catholics everywhere should be urged to put a high value on a college degree. About the number of colleges, I should have stated that under that term the "Catholic Directory" includes high schools, and I think the figures for Maryland and Washington are substantially correct. Will not F. X. M. look up the actual number of Baltimore boys in the various institutions outside of Loyola College and tell us the exact numbers? Then we shall know the total Catholic college population for the Baltimore archdiocese and how many are competing for the city quota. Has Mount St. Mary's no Baltimore boys?

As for Philadelphia and Worcester I am not prepared to say which city has the wealthier Catholic population, but I think Worcester averages higher. The number of dayscholars in

Holy Cross College now is 116 in the college grade, whereas, according to Dr. Burns' figures in the report on Attendance at Catholic Colleges in 1916 St. Joseph had 362 in high school and 68 in college, and Villanova, 215 in high school and 117 in college and 44 in the engineering school. But what of La Salle and the Catholic High School and Overbrook? Have they no boys of the college grade? All these sources should be computed before Philadelphia is shown to be an exception.

I think there is good cooperation everywhere between the priests and the colleges, but in certain sections there are many Catholic colleges, whereas in the large Catholic population of New England we have few colleges, and our priests do not have to distribute their favors.

Worcester, Mass.

FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S.J.

Catholic Publicity

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Permit me to suggest that if "all who are interested in Catholic publicity" do not owe the present writer a vote of thanks, at least he and they are to be congratulated on the success of his inquiry which brought forth from the gifted pen of Mr. Michael Williams such a flood of information regarding the magnificent results accomplished on the Pacific coast by him and his collaborator, Mr. Robert G. Drady. The United War Workers Campaign offered a golden opportunity which they were not slow to recognize, but seized promptly and made the most of. There are many similar, if smaller, pegs on which to hang a tale, or Catholic story, offered practically every day, but we do not seem to use them with that happy gift for taking a chance in which the proverbial Irishman is an adept.

The extraordinary apathy to which Mr. Williams refers, and which the writer has not failed to note in the course of his many years of effort to promote Catholicism, has sometimes led him to doubt whether the Founder of Christianity really meant this to be one of the methods to be employed in the propagation of the Gospel. He commanded His Apostles to preach, but nowhere to write, unless we except the command to St. John in the Apocalypse to "write to the seven churches of Asia." Neither did He himself write anything save "in the sand," and neither the original nor a copy of that epistle has been preserved. He even commanded "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth." On the other hand, He instructed His disciples not to hide their light under a bushel, but to place it where it might be seen by all men. There were no newspapers in Apostolic times, and to suggest their use would have been as premature as to suggest that men should travel by trolley, palace car, or aeroplane, which surely no modern apostle would disdain to make use of in the propagation of the truth. Moreover, we have the positive approval of the Hierarchy, from the Supreme Pontiff down, for the use of the press in this work. Did space permit, I could produce a score or more of letters from bishops and archbishops who heartily approved this form of publicity, when it was first broached with special application to the secular press by the Catholic Truth Society of America, founded in 1890, under the auspices of the late, lamented Archbishop Ireland.

Another thing that the writer has noticed is that any special effort at Catholic publicity is invariably followed by a reaction, or counter-drive. Witness the first Catholic Congress held in Baltimore. But if this life is a continual warfare we cannot hope to escape it and decline to "fight the good fight." The very great need today is to organize and coordinate the scattered forces throughout the country in some concrete form, so that they may co-operate in "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together." Our national motto, "In Union is Strength," should inspire us, for there never was a time when such effort was more needed, or gave promise of greater results. If some-

one with authority will only raise the standard, thousands will flock to its support and gladly enrol themselves in a new crusade.

White Bear Lake, Minn.

WM. F. MARKOE.

Voting in Belgium

To the Editor of AMERICA:

On January 15 the Associated Press sent broadcast over the country a story from its Brussels correspondent reviewing the political situation in Belgium, which contained the following delicious morsel:

Before the war the priests in Belgium had four votes; land owners and nobles as many votes as they had estates in different provinces, and Socialists and Liberals only one vote each. The Socialists were mostly workingmen, and the Liberals mostly professional men. This enabled the Catholic party to be in power for more than forty years.

This wonderful bit of information is a tissue of misstatements, which, on ordinary readers, unacquainted with conditions, will leave the impression that the Catholic party in Belgium is a political autocracy of the worst type. Such distortion of the truth can be the result only of ignorance, which is not to be excused in a correspondent who seemingly is on the ground and can get at the truth very readily. Or it is designed to prejudice readers' minds against the Catholic party. If so, it is an exhibition of bigotry that deserves a rebuke. If someone in New York, before putting the story on the wires, had glanced at the article on Belgium in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," he would have found a wide discrepancy between the information from Brussels and the truth.

The very day the above appeared in the press, I telegraphed to the Associated Press, pointing out the errors of their foreign correspondent. I received a reply by letter, saying that the A. P. would take the matter up "by mail" with their Brussels representative. The pity of it is that truth, traveling by mail, may never succeed in overtaking falsehood traveling by wire. The A. P. prides itself on uncommon accuracy as a news gatherer and purveyor, and has always insisted that it is absolutely unbiased as to politics and religion. It does not claim infallibility for itself or its correspondents. But it would seem that Catholics have to be constantly on their guard; and besides that a willingness, at headquarters, to rectify mistakes quickly would go far towards dissipating all suspicion.

Moline, Ill.

J. B. CULEMANS.

The Students' Volunteer Movement

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read with the greatest satisfaction the splendid article on the Students' Volunteer Movement reprinted from AMERICA in Bulletin No. 1 of the Students' Mission Crusade. I do most earnestly hope that AMERICA continues to take an active interest in this most important work, a movement which is most opportune and destined in the Providence of God to accomplish most marvelous results in the mission field. For the past five months and more I have been visiting the parishes and missions of the Jesuit Fathers in this island of Mindanao, and administering the Sacrament of Confirmation.

I feel proud to be allowed to be associated with these devoted men, after having seen their labors, and knowing the devoted lives they lead, the truly heroic sacrifices they make, and the great good they are doing in spite of the difficulties that confront them. But how much more they could do if they only had some such an organization back of them as the K. C., or such as the non-Catholic missionaries have.

So poor is the diocese, and so great its needs, that when one of the Fathers asked me for an allowance of fifteen pesos (\$15.00) per month for the payment of a teacher for the Catholic

school, I could not grant it. Another asked me to build a Catholic hospital, as his people, when sick, have to go to the Protestant hospital, some of them dying there without the Sacraments on account of the bigotry of the doctor-missionary in charge. I made an appeal to my friends and, thanks to their generosity, I received small amounts, but nothing sufficient for works such as hospitals and dormitories.

I wish we had a society such as the Protestants have in the Students' Volunteer Crusade or the Y. M. C. A. for our foreign missions. You can accomplish great things through your magazine AMERICA in behalf of the Catholic Students' Mission crusade.

This crusade will not interfere with the Propagation of the Faith or the Catholic Church Extension Society, but rather will aid them. There cannot be the least doubt that a National Federation of the Catholic Students' Mission crusade, with the approval of the Hierarchy of the United States and our Holy Father, as well established and efficiently carried on as is the Protestant Students' Mission movement, would accomplish results in the mission field that would mark the movement as truly an epoch-making work. My extremely busy missionary life leaves me little time for writing, but so important is this new movement that I feel that I should show at least my appreciation for it.

JAMES P. MCCLOSKEY,

Zamboanga, P. I.

Bishop of Zamboanga.

Ruth Sawyer's "Doctor Danny"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Will you kindly allow me a word in praise of a new book: Ruth Sawyer's "Doctor Danny"? Neither the author, distinguished in present-day American letters, nor her book need an advertising word; but thousands of readers, thankful for the scent of a worthy newcomer (which may not be featured in "best-seller" advertisements) may greet a word about this exquisite collection of Irish stories. Exquisite they are from several viewpoints, the material, the atmosphere, the lights and shadows, and the art, it is art, of the story-teller. Ruth Sawyer is of the tribe of *seanichies*: I shall not call her unique, for Jane Barlow, ahead of her in time, walks with the same pace and talks with the same grace. But Ruth Sawyer, unlike Jane Barlow, had to cross the Atlantic, a visitor to the land of this story material; and it is her unique praise that she exercised a splendid faculty, apprehensive, sympathetic, universal in its purview, and penetrating in its visual depths. Among recent writers in this field, Daniel Corkery, with his keen skill in "A Munster Twilight," and such may be allowed mention; but his insistence upon an atmosphere of depressive gloom (Russian realism, the stereotyped phrase called it) makes his stature smaller than that of Ruth Sawyer, or of Jane Barlow of an earlier generation. I think of the Scotch clergyman and his stories, Ian Maclaren and "The Bonnie Brier Bush," artistic, wholesome, and classic, if for this quality the test be the pleasure in going to a rereading; but, even though Ian Maclaren captivated America (and took away \$50,000 in a season of subsequent lectures), I feel that a tribunal, academic or popular, would give the palm in this *genre* of story-telling to Ruth Sawyer and her "Doctor Danny." Modes of thought, characterizations, scenic settings: how intimately has she studied these at her university, or shall we say, the hedge-school, there in the remote hills of Ireland, close to the hearts and the hearths of the people, genuine and good. And though not of the Faith which actuates the lives of this folk, Ruth Sawyer has transcribed the imprint of that vital force. How many a hero and heroine of her beautiful pages lifts up joyful eyes from an environment of sorrow, because he would "look across the cabin to the crucifix that hung under the picture of the Virgin," and be able to say, "I know, I know. I, too, have tasted the reed."

Holy Cross, Worcester.

MICHAEL EARLS, S.J.

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

One Road to Anarchy

THERE is an impression abroad that this country has one code of law for the rich and another for the poor. That impression is growing, but it is, of course, founded on error. Before the law, all men are equal, and the State, if it touch the balance of justice, weights the scale in favor of the weak and the defenseless. The error is not in the law, but in its occasional administration, and not so much in the administration, as in the harpy crew of shysters who, by some strange sufferance, are allowed to disgrace an honored profession. The advocate, pleading at the bar, is an officer of the law, an adviser of the bench. He has no function other than to assist the court to reach the truth and assess justice. Such was the ancient conception, which today seems almost a burlesque. If the law and the courts have fallen into disrepute, not the long-haired, hungry Socialist at the corner must bear the blame, nor the violent, half-insane "Red" haranging a hallful of fanatics, but the sleek, purseproud "respectable" lawyer, who tells the truth for once, when he boasts that he can drive a coach and four through any law of God or man.

Two years ago an arrogant band of plutocratic "reformers," whose names still besmirch many a church register, gathered over \$2,000,000 to purchase the elections in the City of New York. To corrupt the electorate is the most heinous of civic crimes, but the men who tried, and failed, to buy New York, yet walk with shameless, undiminished heads. Worse, they teach in Sunday schools, and in the Sacred Name of Jesus, head subscriptions for the relief of sufferers in whatever country may happen to be rich in metal mines and deep wells of oil. Their miserable tools, Sol. Lipsky, A. Silberlust, H. Goldblatt, and fifty-seven others, poor, very probably, because the price of their daily bread depends upon arbitrary wills of tyrannical masters, were most properly sent to jail. But the plutocratic anarchists who engineered this plot against law and order, where are they?

They had "good lawyers." Therefore some of them are now at Palm Beach, while the bread line lengthens

in New York, and some of them are at the St. Regis. But not one of them is on Blackwell's Island or in Sing Sing, where every one of the thieving crew should be. Meanwhile the Red Flag waves, but that means nothing to these perpetually immune criminals. They have no country and they have no loyalty. Their acts forbid either supposition. When the crash comes, and the innocent poor are once more crushed to a compost of blood and street-dirt, they will be found taking their ease under soft and languid foreign skies. They are not Americans, and never were. They are a mass of rottenness, and out of the corruption they engender, springs anarchy.

Talk as you like, you will never convince the family, the friends and the acquaintances of Ignatz Luft who "did six months on the Island," that the same law exists in this country for Ignatz Luft and the other fifty-nine tools, and for the plutocrats who paid them, or promised to pay them, for the commission of crime. Police orders to tear down the Red Flag are good enough as far as they go. But infinitely better would be a court order summoning to immediate incarceration at Sing Sing, the immoral crew of wealthy malefactors against whose shameful misdeeds the Red Flag is a protest, pitiful and inadequate.

The Wreck of the Mayflower

AS even Macaulay's schoolboy knows, the godly emigrants disembarking from the goodly ship Mayflower, fell first upon their knees, next upon the Indians, and then upon all and sundry who even hesitated a partial lack of agreement. Science now indicates that in the end, they fell upon themselves, and closed all by wrecking the Mayflower. A grim, gloomy, hard-bitted lot, they are romantic only in the retrospect of history and the pages of Nathaniel Hawthorne. They ducked their scolds and hanged their witches and discovered the New England conscience. In their quieter moments of ease and dalliance, they invented pumpkin-pie, hard cider and the wooden nutmeg. But aside from these activities, they had other uses. They loved learning, and founded schools to make good scholars and good Christians. They never lived contentedly under a tyrant. They talked about "the free skies of New England," and finally made the reality, as well as the phrase, popular. Their numerous progeny overflowed the land, and when the time came at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill, these sturdy yeomen wrote a story at which every liberty-loving heart must thrill. If they were not comfortable neighbors, their ancient spirit, made purer and somewhat human by the bleak winds that swept along the granite coasts, was for many a call to high ideals and persistent striving. New England "cuteness" was not mere cunning. It was often a name given in derision by envious, comfort-loving triflers, who had never learned the power of hard work.

Therefore our regret that the Mayflower has gone upon

the rocks. The power which once ruled New England, a strong, robust, bigoted religion, ran from Puritanism through Unitarianism, straight into the bog of skepticism, and there it stuck. Coincident with this loss of religion was the loss of love of their kind. "They kept themselves alive, unquestionably," as Hawthorne wrote of a feathered tribe, "not for any pleasure of their own, but that the world might not absolutely lose what had once been so admirable a breed of fowls." But they trifled with the law of their nature, and God smote them. A study recently issued by Holmes and Dowd of the University of California asserts that their present rate of multiplication is not one-half of what it should be, even to keep the stock stationary. Unless a change takes place, within another 300 years, all the descendants of the Mayflower emigrants may be comfortably placed in another Mayflower. Nobody would tread on his neighbor's toes, except in token of a revival of the original spirit, and there might be enough of them to man the ship.

The lesson is plain. When a people cast religion aside, morality soon dies. Education, refinement, love of country, are but empty words to those whose standard of right and wrong is their own comfort. Men may desecrate the nature God gives them, but God is not mocked. He can bide His time, and upon the country and race that scorn Him, His vengeance is complete.

The Smith Bill and an American Institution

YOURS may be "a religious neighborhood," but there are others in which nine out of every ten citizens hardly know the difference between a church and a city clerk's office or an undertaker's establishment. It is a place in which some people are married and others buried, and further neither their knowledge nor their interest goes. Taking the totals for the United States, we reach the conclusion that of every ten citizens, only four have an affiliation with any church of any description. When it is added that membership in many ecclesiastical societies may be obtained upon terms merely nominal, it is clear that as a people, we are fast losing sight of the ancient landmarks once so common in this once Christian country.

The causes of this sad change are many, but the most powerful, undoubtedly, is the rise of the secularized school. Time was when the common schools were definitely Christian in teaching as well as in purpose, and even after that time had passed, many were able to exercise a strong Christian influence upon their young charges, because of the religious character of the teachers. With the advance, through the normal schools and colleges, of "secularization," that educational folly which deliberately ignores the hugest facts and strongest motive forces of existence, the Christian influence of the common schools disappeared, and with it a characteristic American institution. Contrary to the facts of history, the public school has been persistently heralded as the

most genuinely American institution. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In the formative days of this Republic, there was not a public school, as we now know it, in the length and breadth of the land. Not for years later did the school learn to be ashamed of God and His Christ. If the present-day public school wishes to trace its ancestry, it must go back through a miasm of atheistic French and German philosophy to the atheistic Julian the Apostate. From the days of Plymouth Rock down to our own, the school most characteristically American is the school which, like the Fathers of this Republic, daily acknowledges the sovereignty of Almighty God and our consequent duties towards Him. Neither atheism nor the foolish attempt to ignore Almighty God in any sphere of life, strikes a native root in America.

Senator Smith's motives in establishing Federal domination over the schools may be the most patriotic, yet his plan embodies the extremest policies of foreign secularists. With them, the State is the source of all power, and all social, religious and educational activities exist only by grant of the secular authorities. The Smith bill not only transfers the control of the local schools to Washington, but by subsidizing the secularized schools, tends to destroy all schools in which a knowledge of Almighty God is held to be of any importance. If this plan clashes with your concept of American ideals, now is the time to register your protest with the two Senators who represent your State at Washington, and with your Congressman.

Ireland, Once Again.

THE Irish problem has taken a new and vexed turn, not through Ireland's fault, but through England's perversity in not approving of an act which Great Britain herself bade the Irish perform. And the strange part of the present tangle is, that this is the first time in centuries that Erin has done Britain's bidding, and yet Britain is not only sulking over it, but is actually threatening dire reprisals, in the form of many a pound of Irish flesh and a river or two of Irish blood. What can be the matter with Great Britain? Surely, she is sincere, at least now, in this terrible crisis in which her very existence is threatened. Have the horrors of war blunted her keen sense of justice or dried up the fountain of her exquisite humor? For four years and more she exhorted and even prodded Ireland to action, and now, to the amazement of the multitude, she is angry that Ireland has fulfilled her behests. The very last pre-war sentence that England spoke was a protestation that the consideration which made her jump to arms was the freedom of small nations. But Ireland has won freedom, has obtained that for which England declared she sacrificed men and money beyond counting. Why then does England sulk and threaten? Was she sincere four years ago? And during the course of the war Great Britain protested to all the world that she was fighting for the

freedom of small nations and would end the war the instant she was convinced that the aforesaid nations were safe in the possession of liberty. Ireland is safe in the possession of liberty; rather, Ireland would be safe in such possession, if Great Britain, the nation which waged war that small nations might be free, would let her alone. What is the matter with England? Surely she is not hypocritical, especially now when the Bolsheviks are ready to submerge her. Yet there are her words and there are her acts, and they are contradictory.

The fact of the matter is, England is playing the most dangerous game of her history. Heretofore she tried to fool the poor, oppressed Irish only, now she is striving to fool the world, and the world will not be fooled. Jaws are set in the United States, Canada, Ireland, England and wherever the great issue is understood. And that issue is: the war was fought for democracy and democracy must be extended to Ireland too. The sooner Great Britain stops her acting and becomes honest, the better for the world, but for herself especially, for she is nearing the brink of a precipice, a fact she would do well to recognize before it is too late.

Joyce Kilmer's Catholicism

“ONCE a Catholic, there never was any possibility of mistaking Kilmer's point of view,” writes Mr. Robert C. Holliday in his admirable memoir of his friend. “In all matters of religion, art, economics and politics, as well as in all matters of faith and morals, his point of view was obviously and unhesitatingly Catholic.” Perhaps there is nothing more striking in the numerous letters of Kilmer, that follow the memoir, than the evidence they give of how thoroughly this four-year-old convert had made his own the consistent Catholic's habit of mind. “I like to feel that I have always been a Catholic,” Sergeant Kilmer used to say. “I believed in the Catholic position, the Catholic view of ethics and esthetics for a long time.” A “searing test of the spirit,” caused by a great domestic sorrow, had to be passed through, however, before Kilmer received the gift of faith. But shortly after being received into the Church he could write: “My wife and I are very comfortable, now that we are Catholics. We feel that we're where we belong.”

Sergeant Kilmer's Catholicism, as his poems and letters abundantly prove, was characterized by that attractive blending of mirth and piety that is worlds away from the dourness of Puritanism. “A convert to Catholicism,” he once wrote, “is not a person who wanders about weeping over autumn winds and dead leaves, mumbling Latin and sniffing incense.” As for his idea of the Catholic author's mission, it is made unmistakably clear in a letter in which he said:

I don't think Catholic writers should spend their time writing tracts and Sunday school books, but I think that the Faith should illuminate everything they write, grave or gay. The Faith is radiantly apparent in your last poems. It is in Tom Daly's clowning as it is in his loftier moods. Of course

anyone would rather write like Francis Thompson than like Swinburne. But I can honestly say that I'd rather write like John Ayscough than like William Makepeace Thackeray—ininitely greater artist though Thackeray be. You see, the Catholic Faith is such a thing that I'd rather write moderately well about it than magnificently well about anything else. It is more important, more beautiful, more necessary than anything else in life.

Regarding Sergeant Kilmer's deeper spiritual life, the memorial edition of his works contains numerous passages which indicate how solid and childlike his piety was. “There is no priest now in this town, but there is a fine old church with God in it,” he wrote from France last spring. And in another self-revealing letter sent to a nun he said:

Pray that I may love God more. It seems to me that if I can learn to love God more passionately, more constantly, without distractions, that absolutely nothing else can matter. Except while we are in the trenches I receive Holy Communion every morning, so it ought to be all the easier for me to attain this object of my prayers. I got faith, you know, by praying for it. I hope to get love the same way.

It was the dearest wish of Sergeant Kilmer's heart that his eldest son should be an altar-boy and eventually a priest. “Is Kenton serving Mass yet? Please have him do so,” are almost the concluding words in the last letter he wrote.

From the foregoing paragraphs it will be seen that Joyce Kilmer's Catholicism had about it none of the blemishes that too often impair the beauty and consistency of some of his American fellow-Catholics' faith and practice nowadays. He was anything but the snobbish, invertebrate, apologetic or pietistic type of Catholic. He abhorred from the depths of his soul, as one of his letters proves, “professional Catholics,” with all their works and pomps, and the honor of having a priestly vocation in his family was one he knew how to value properly. The wide diffusion of this staunch Catholic's memorial volumes will doubtless do much to make his readers imitators of his virtues.

Standardized Domesticity

“HOUSEWORK wanted by young Irish girl. Two in the family. Apartment,” a kind of “want-ad” that is quite common nowadays, threatens to prove no less grave a peril to the American family than are apartment-house landlords, summer hotels and automobiles, is the opinion of Mr. Simeon Strunsky who writes feelingly on the servant-girl problem in the February *Harper's*. That loyal old-fashioned retainer who used to keep his master, mistress and ten little children from the poorhouse by offering them with streaming eyes his long-saved wages is now no more. Modern servants prefer that their relations with their employers should not be at all intimate and patriarchal. They want their calling standardized as all the trades are and they look forward hopefully to securing well-paid eight-hour shifts in the home like those that have prevailed in the

munitions factory. Instead of having one nurse, for instance, to take care of the children for twenty-four hours a day, the parents of growing families will be forced to secure three eight-hour nurses who must each be paid the same daily wages that the old-fashioned nurse received. As for the servant who cooks the breakfast, perhaps she can be induced, if properly recompensed, to prepare lunch too, but the rules of the Domestic Cooks' Union will in all probability, absolutely forbid her to get the dinner ready also. For that important meal a high-salaried specialist will be needed. House-maids too will demand not only a more circumscribed field of activities, but shorter hours as well. When Molly has made the beds, no prudent housekeeper will dare ask her to dust the parlor too, and if Celeste has helped milady dress for the ball, she cannot be expected to wait up for her employer's return. Another maid must be hired for that.

But if all domestic servants, besides demanding that their work and hours be standardized, and that after all is only just and reasonable, should also require, like the

Irish girl whose advertisement was quoted above, that the family she works for should always consist of only two members, a ship much smaller than the *Mayflower* will eventually be quite large enough to hold all the surviving descendants of the Pilgrims. The national bird of Erin, as all the world knows, is the stork. But many American families of Irish ancestry are already showing a dangerous tendency to imitate their neighbors of Puritan blood in neglecting to bring up a flock of children. The landlord, the grocer, the clothier and the maker of automobiles have conspired together, it is said, to force the so-called "moderately well-to-do" American families to have only one or two children, or, more often, none at all. The great cost of commodities is the usual excuse such men and women give for shirking their duty, though unchristian selfishness and a pagan love for ease and luxury are of course the real reasons why they neglect their duty. If they can now plausibly add: "And besides, no servant will work for a family of more than two," the outlook for our country's future is dark indeed.

Literature

HOWELLS AND HIS GODFATHER

IT is a far cry from the declining days of Spanish glory to Martin's Ferry, Ohio, in 1837; and yet we cannot rightly appraise the artistic worth and literary skill of William Dean Howells unless we recognize in him a link of kinship between the Spain of the hidalgos and the Middle West of pre-Lincoln times. Many readers of American fiction—and at least one writer of it, I am sure—would assume that the birth and childhood of William Dean Howells were distinctly matter-of-course events; but such an attitude toward the novelist and his writings will never do at all. You will fail in your endeavor to understand and evaluate the work of our gracious dean of American letters unless you invoke Peter Pan and believe in fairies.

Rather must you envisage the cradle of the future novelist as haunted by familiar sprites. The shade of Fielding was there, a bit rueful and impatient; the shade of Scott, big-hearted and serene; Balzac, too, drew close to the infant form; and a gentleman who was not quite a gentleman from Augustan Rome, and who used to answer to the name of Quintus Horatius Flaccus, found in the new-born baby a source of promise and delight. Each of these worthies, and many more whom we might name, hovered about the cradle of little Willie Howells, eager to be his literary godfather. But the guardian angel of the tiny boy frowned upon them and they all vanished into thin air. And just when it looked as though the child was to have no literary godfather at all, the angel smiled as broadly as an angel dare ever smile and beckoned to a shade in a far-off corner with both his susurrant wings; and lo, there stepped forth the great-souled Knight of La Mancha, as gaunt and as nondescript as you please, but with the light of genius in his eye and the flame of chivalry in his heart. And the angel said to Don Quixote: "This child you must take unto you, for it is so decreed."

Mr. Howells himself, it is only fair to say, makes no direct mention of this illuminating episode, but he hints at it broadly in ever so many passages of his self-revealing reminiscences, in "A Boy's Town," and "My Literary Passions" and "Years of My Youth." He learned to know and love the great master-

piece of Cervantes; he studied Spanish the better to read the wonderful book as it came from its maker's hand; he absorbed its humor, its satire, its keen observation, its warm human qualities. Its influence upon him was all the greater because unconscious. For the lanky and lovable knight was a most considerate godfather and bestowed his gifts without ostentation. He followed his godchild to Hamilton and Cincinnati and Columbus, to the American consulate at Venice, to the Boston of Emerson and Longfellow and the *Atlantic Monthly*, to New York and the "Easy Chair" in *Harper's Magazine*. And ever and always the pensive shade would murmur: "This child shall be like unto me, even though he suspect it not."

So it came to pass that the Knight of La Mancha dowered his favorite with a passion for style, a divine discontent with anything short of perfection in literary form. "I loved form, I loved style, I loved diction," Mr. Howells tells us, "and I strove for them all, rejecting my faultier ideals when I discovered them, and cleaving to the truer. . . . In the spirit of my endeavor there was no variableness; always I strove for grace, for distinctness, for light; and my soul detests obscurity still." And the grave Don almost smiled while the young man ground out yards and yards of mediocre verse, for he knew that thus was forming a prose style facile and unique; and at an opportune moment he suggested "Their Wedding Journey," the young man wrote it, and the rest—"A Woman's Reason," "Indian Summer," "April Hopes," "The Leatherwood God" and scores of other novels. All this is American literary history.

Literary students with a penchant for calling names are fond of designating both Cervantes and Howells realists, and Howells himself glories in the appellation. But every great writer is an adiabolist; he is beyond labels and defies classification. We do not read Cervantes because he describes a barber's brass basin any more than we read Howells because he describes Irene Lapham's bit of pine-shaving, but because Cervantes invests the basin with the romance of knighthood as Howells crowns the shaving with the aureola of love. Perhaps, as the belated admirers of Zola and the purblind devotees of Barbusse and Dreiser would have us believe, he is a great artist who can

so convincingly describe a dunghill that his pages smell to heaven; possibly none but a realist can impressively inform us that the property of rain is to wet and of fire to burn. Such, I grant you, is the realism of real water in a real bucket. But such a theory of art does not explain Cervantes; and it does not explain Howells.

Not a bad definition of all art is, "Life seen through a temperament." And in the art of fiction it is the temperament of the novelist that chiefly matters. The actual, literal barber's brass basin would bore us to death, but seen through the temperament of Cervantes it becomes a perennial delight; the pine-shaving, in itself and of itself, is beneath our notice, but illuminated by the play of Howells' art it is forever set apart from things common and unclean. Your criticaster may dub an author realist or romanticist or moralist or idealist or mystic or impressionist or rhapsodist or futurist; but not all the dubbing in the world will explain why we read him. We read him because the temperament through which he envisions life quickens within us a responsive mood. Truly, the only vital basis of literary criticism is the salutary distortion of a familiar proverb: "Show me your temperament and I'll tell you what you are."

Now, Cervantes and Howells have in common a temperament which is able to glorify trivial and everyday objects. I am not for a moment assuming that "A Hazard of New Fortunes" is as great a book as "Don Quixote," or that Bartley Hubbard is as exquisitely conceived a character as Sancho Panza; I merely hold that these two writers, each in his own day and place and generation, throw the glamour of their temperament, like a cloak of woven magic, over things and persons not in the least extraordinary, and that in both instances the result is art—

For, don't you mark? we're made so that we love
First when we see them painted, things we have passed
Perhaps a hundred times nor cared to see.
. . . Art was given for that.

The temperamental glamour flung by Howells and his godfather is not the glamour of idealism. They are not of the school of Corneille, nor of the school of Maria Edgeworth and Parson Weems. Don Quixote, measured by everyday standards, is a good deal of a fool; and Silas Lapham, measured by any standards, is a good deal of an ass. It is the triumph of art in both instances that we admire the fool and respect the ass—largely because a fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind. Both Cervantes and Howells, within their limitations, tell the truth about human life and human nature; it is not less the truth because it is not invariably flattering. Though most of Howells' women are weak-minded and often silly, they do not repel us, for we recognize their truth to life, precisely as we sanction Shakespeare's gallery of male protagonists even though, as Ruskin all but accurately insisted, there is not a hero among them. "Why," a lady once asked Howells, "don't you give us a grand, noble, perfect woman?" And the author answered simply and conclusively, "Because I'm waiting for the Almighty to begin." "I think," the novelist continues, commenting on the incident,

that women as a rule are better and nobler than men, but they are not perfect. I am extremely opposed to what are called ideal characters. I think their portrayal is mischievous; it is altogether offensive to me as an artist, and, as far as the morality goes, I believe that when an artist tries to create an ideal he mixes some truth up with a vast deal of sentimentality, and produces something that is extremely noxious as well as nauseous. . . . He tempts young men and women to form themselves upon models that would be detestable in life, if they were ever found there.

This profession of faith in original sin I respectfully and urgently submit to the soulful consideration of novelists and

historians and biographers—especially to all hagiographers. To every word of it Cervantes would subscribe.

No idealist is Howells; but neither is he a purveyor of indecency. He has never subscribed to the theory of filth for art's sake. Unlike certain fescennine men and lurid ladies who at times invade the elysium of the six best-sellers, Howells has realized that art, like life, has its reticences and reservations. To him the muck-heap, the morgue and the shambles of the human spirit are not fit subjects for literary portraiture; he knows that art is selection, and therefore elimination. Cervantes, surely, taught him that, for Don Quixote—and is it not in the main the secret of his lure?—was a Galahad at heart.

Howells never has forgotten the admonition given him in his green and salad days by Henry D. Cooke, a distinguished Ohio editor: "Never write anything you would be ashamed to read to a woman." How well Howells has heeded the advice let his hundred books attest. "It seems not to be so now with our novelists," he says with characteristic point and gentleness; "they write many things they ought to be ashamed to read to women, or if they are of that sex, things they should be ashamed to read to men. But perhaps they are ashamed and only hold out writing so for art's sake; I cannot very well speak for them; but I am still very Victorian in my preference of decency."

America would do well to give more and more heed to the preferences of William Dean Howells as the years spread apace and wild and turgid fashions in art and letters have their day and cease to be. In the plenitude of years and powers, the kindly and genial octogenarian wields yet a magic pen. Repeatedly urged to fill the chair of English literature at Harvard, at Yale, at Johns Hopkins, this man who never went to school prefers to labor as craftsman and critic in the house of the written word. Since the death of Hopkinson Smith he is our first literary gentleman. Of Boston's Back Bay he is the Boswell and Herodotus; of American letters he is uncrowned and undisputed king. His throne is the Easy Chair, and he discourses enchantingly of books and ideas, of the promise-crammed present and the hallowed past. And as he speaks, it requires little fancy to see dimly outlined behind the Easy Chair a figure armed at all points absurdly cap-a-pie who sometimes bends over and whispers in his godchild's ear; and then we know not whether it is the mellow voice of Howells or the ardent voice of Don Quixote that bravely assures us: "The world is always young and innocent when it is not old and virtuous."

BROTHER LEO.

MOONLIGHT

The moon reached in cold hands across the sill
And touched me as I lay sleeping;
And in my sleep I thought of sorrowful things;
I wakened, and I lay weeping.

I could hear on the beach below the small waves break
And fall on the silver shingle,
And the sound of a footstep passing in the street
Where lamplight and moonlight mingle.

And I said: "All day I can turn my face to the sun
And lead my thoughts to laughter,
But I hope in my heart that I never shall sleep again
Because of the pain thereafter."

The moon's pale fingers wandered across my face
And the arm where my hot cheek rested,
And because of the tears in my eyes I could not see
Where the black waves rocked, moon-crested.

ALINE KILMER.

REVIEWS

Frank Duveneck. By NORBERT HEERMANN. With Illustrations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$2.00.

"After all's said, Frank Duveneck is the greatest talent of the brush of this generation," was the verdict of John Singer Sargent, the eminent American painter, on the subject of this little biography. Duveneck was a Catholic Kentuckian, having been born at Covington in 1848 and receiving his early education from the Benedictine Fathers, who also started him on his artistic career, for they employed the talented boy in church-decorating work of various kinds. Adopting that calling in his youth, he had a great deal of valuable experience adorning churches in many different places before he entered the Munich Royal Academy in 1870.

Duveneck's progress was remarkable. During his first year in the art school he took most of the prizes, and in 1872 his famous "Whistling Boy" was painted, a canvas which shows the chief characteristics of his style: "an astonishing virtuosity of brush-work closely related to Franz Hals, in which the daring and yet perfectly controlled hand defines planes, textures, and color with an unhesitating brush-loaded with paint." Returning to this country in 1873, he undertook some church-decorating and painted portraits, achieving his first American recognition in Boston two years later. In 1878 Duveneck started in Munich an art school, subsequently transferred to Florence, which was attended by a large and enthusiastic body of English and American students, many of whom afterwards became eminent artists. Eighteen hundred and eighty found him interested in etching, too, and he produced at Venice during the next few years some twenty notable plates. In 1888 the artist returned to America and opened a studio in Cincinnati, where he taught until his death last month. In the San Francisco Exposition he had a "one-man gallery," which included about thirty of his oil paintings and a dozen etchings. There is now a permanent collection of his canvases, sculptures and etchings in the Cincinnati Museum. Duveneck's last work of importance was the decoration of the beautiful cathedral in his native town. Mr. Heermann's excellent memoir contains a score of photographs of Mr. Duveneck's best work, with a short critical appraisal of each picture.

W. D.

The History of Henry Fielding. By WILBUR L. CROSS. In Three Volumes. New Haven: Yale University Press. \$15.00.

The reader who finishes the 1273 pages of this exhaustive work, including its seventy-seven pages of bibliography, will doubtless feel that the painstaking author has not left out a single detail of Fielding's life, any circumstance attending the composition of his plays, pamphlets or novels, or any important critical estimate of the man or his books, which patient research could discover. Many of Mr. Cross's readers will probably consider that much of the meticulous scholarship he displays regarding each of the salacious farces and comedies with which young Fielding kept the pot boiling, had been better employed on a worthier subject, but the student of eighteenth-century English literature who rests uneasy until he knows everything there is to know about the author of "Tom Jones" will have his curiosity thoroughly gratified by Mr. Cross.

Henry Fielding belonged to the Earl of Denbigh's family, was born near Glastonbury in 1707, went through Eton, studied literature at Leyden University, came to London at the age of twenty-three and began to write for the stage, turning out a number of indecent pieces which were well received by the theater-goers of the period. The Licensing act of 1737 closed Fielding's playhouse, however, so he turned to journalism for a livelihood, editing a tri-weekly paper called the *Champion*, the first number of which appeared November 15, 1739. In 1741 he published a pamphlet entitled "Shamela," a burlesque of Richardson's novel "Pamela," which had recently appeared, and it

was in scornful rivalry of his brother novelist that Fielding the year following wrote "The History and Adventures of Joseph Andrews," another parody on "Pamela." Then followed his "Miscellanies," including a satirical pamphlet called "Jonathan Wild," which describes a thief's adventures as if they were those of a great man.

"Tom Jones," the six-volume work on which Fielding's reputation chiefly rests, appeared early in 1749, the copyright bringing him £600. It is an artistically constructed novel of the picaresque type, painting all too faithfully the lax morals of eighteenth-century England. Two years later, "Amelia," a sort of "continuation of 'Tom Jones,'" was published, but it did not prove so successful as its forerunner. Mr. Cross thinks the book's "broken-nosed heroine" was too great a handicap. "A Voyage to Lisbon," whither he went in 1754 in the hope of regaining his failing health, was his last work. He died at Junqueira, Portugal, October 8, 1754, and was buried in the British cemetery at Lisbon.

Mr. Cross believes and produces strong evidence to prove that Fielding's books were by no means a transcript of his life. The author of "Jonathan Wild" was certainly a zealous magistrate and did much to mitigate the inhuman severity of the laws of his time, and he was working at a defense of revealed religion in answer to Bolingbroke's attacks on Christianity, when his feeble health forced him to leave the book unfinished. Mr. Cross's wide reading enables him to make the England of Fielding's time very vivid and actual.

W. D.

Wasp Studies Afield. By PHIL and NELLIE RAU. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press. \$2.00.

This volume is a monument to the patience of these devoted entomologists. Every page has meant hours, days, years of patient squatting near a tiny hole in the ground, notebook in hand, counting mud-pellets and measuring cinders. Such pains and sacrifices to add one mite to the world's permanent store of knowledge is idealism of a very high type. Though their ultimate aim, "the construction of a synthetic genetic psychology of wasps," seems something of a mirage owing to the inherent difficulties of comparative psychology, one can have nothing but admiration for these first laborious steps. About sixty of the 10,000 species of solitary wasps are here described. The observations and experiments, many of them real contributions to the study, while noted with scientific precision, have too that welcome touch of quaint expression and intimate sympathy with insects, which is familiar to lovers of Fabre.

If only the notes could have been published without preface, introduction and general conclusions "Wasp Studies Afield" would be a better book. Specialists always make their mistakes on "general conclusions." The introduction by Professor Wheeler of Harvard does little more than make the reader suspicious of the rest of the book. Let this estimate of Fabre outline his scientific attitude: Fabre as a mathematician, physicist and chemist had a fatal weakness "for clean-cut laws." Then, too, the poor old fellow was "too set in his way of thinking when the origin of species appeared to acquire any sympathy with evolutionary theories." Professor Wheeler assumes that "all biologists are now thorough-going evolutionists" and puts down things like "the whole mammalian class, man of course included, has had a shorter evolution." All the irritating assurance of fifty years ago. Moreover, Fabre was tainted "by a belief in the scholastic conception of instinct" for the explanation of which "his final appeal was always to some mysterious cause," nor do his books leave us any doubt as to the Divine nature of this mysterious cause. Owing to this fatal "preconception" he is impressively stigmatized "mystery monger." The spectacle of a man whose eyes are scarfed up at this late date with so shopworn a thing as natural selection writing about another's "preconceptions" is quite diverting. The authors, too, if not as

outspoken as the evolutionists they admire, have "preconceptions" of their own. They endorse Forel's definition of instinct as "reasoning organized and automatized," leaving God certainly at a convenient distance, and feature throughout the individual adaptations, which must always accompany invariable instinct, as so many arguments in support of their theory. The best thing in the book is the scant ceremony shown Loeb and his antiquated mechanism.

R. I. G.

The English Poets. Selections with Critical Introductions by Various Writers and a General Introduction by MATTHEW ARNOLD. Edited by THOMAS HUMPHRY WARD, M.A., Vol. V. Browning to Rupert Brooke. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.50.

This new volume of Mr. Ward's well-known series contains short critical papers on the work of fifty English poets who died within the last thirty years or so, and selections from their poems. As few lovers of poetry are really satisfied with anthologies made for them by others, many omissions of favorite poems will of course be noted. The Catholic poets represented in the book are Cardinal Newman, Aubrey de Vere, Coventry Patmore, Ernest Dowson, Lionel Johnson, and Francis Thompson, and with the exception perhaps of the last-named author, the examples quoted of their work are fairly adequate and characteristic. Thomas Hardy, who contributes the paper on William Barnes, regrets that the Dorset-dialect poet did not write in simple English, and charges him with "putting into the mouths of husbandmen compound epithets that certainly no use of the dialect ever concocted." Edmund Gosse, who appraises Coventry Patmore, calls him "a highly original and passionate writer to whom scarcely anything was denied except pertinacity in the art of construction." Laurence Binyon finds in the best of Lionel Johnson's poems "a mingling of austerity and ornateness, of ardor and discipline, which give them a peculiar distinction." The admirable selection of lyrics which Sir Sidney Colvin makes from the poetry of Robert Louis Stevenson, who generally wrote in verse, "when he was too tired to write in prose," includes these musical stanzas entitled "In Memoriam F. A. S."

Yet, O stricken heart, remember, O remember
How of human days he lived the better part.
April came to bloom and never dim December
Breathed its killing chills upon the head or heart.
Doomed to know not winter, only spring, a being,
Trod the flowery April blithely for a while,
Took his fill of music, joy of thought and seeing,
Came and stayed and went, nor ever ceased to smile.
Came and stayed and went, and now that all is finished,
You alone have crossed the melancholy stream,
Yours the pang, but his, O his the undiminished,
Undecaying gladness, undeparted dream.
All that life contains of torture, toil and treason,
Shame, dishonor, death to him were but a name.
Here, a boy, he dwelt through all the singing season,
And ere the day of sorrow departed as he came.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

"War Addresses from Catholic Pulpit and Platform" (Wagner, \$2.50) contains some fifty sermons or speeches delivered by American Cardinals, Bishops, priests and laymen on the duty of patriotism and loyalty. The volume is an eloquent record of the whole-hearted response that the Church in this country made to the nation's call to arms. The editor explains that some of the conspicuous omissions from the collection are due to "want of space or opportunity."—Father Philip Coghlan, C.P., has written a handy little book on "The Parables of Jesus" (Kenedy, \$1.00), in which he brings home in simple language the lessons Our Lord taught in His parables.—Cardinal Bourne writes a preface for a new edition of Pope Pius X's "Letter to Catholic Priests" (Kenedy, \$0.45) written on the fiftieth anniversary of his priesthood. The booklet can be

easily slipped into the pocket. And so can the convenient "thin edition" of Father Lasance's "Manna of the Soul" (Benziger, \$0.75), which is made up largely of devotions from the *Raccolta* and from the Church's liturgical books.

Perhaps there is no piece of literature that will give in so small a compass a more faithful account of what the Church in Mexico has had to endure at the hands of Carranza than can be gained from the perusal of the "Memoirs of the Most Reverend Francisco Orozco y Jimenez, Archbishop of Guadalajara, Mexico" (Extension Press, Chicago). His Grace tells the story of his adventures during the ten months following the return to his diocese in November, 1916, until he was banished from Mexico last summer, after suffering all kinds of insults and injuries. Because Archbishop Jimenez wrote a brave pastoral letter protesting against the Government's persecution of the Church, he was charged with conspiracy and with inciting the people to rebellion. Accordingly he was seized by one of Carranza's lieutenants, placed in a cattle-car, and expelled from the country. The pamphlet, which has been translated from the Spanish, is fully documented and is a sad history of persecution on the part of the Government which the United States has helped to set up.

"The Forty-Niners," Stewart Edward White's "Chronicle of the California Trail and El Dorado," and "The Passing of the Frontier," Emerson Hough's "Chronicle of the Old West," which are two volumes of the Yale University "Chronicles of America Series," do not seem to rise to the high standard set by other volumes of the series. Because Mr. Hough does not make the most of his material, he produces a rather tame and desultory book. Mr. White had so interesting a period to describe that his volume is readable, but the style he uses and the readiness with which he employs slang and colloquialisms rob the work of dignity. He considers Padre Serra a "fanatic."—Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes's two-volume work, "A Political and Social History of Modern Europe" (Macmillan, \$4.50), a book which was favorably reviewed in AMERICA last year, has recently been reprinted.

The popularity of Lieutenant Streeter's "Dere Mable—Love Letters of a Rookie," a book which has reached its 550th thousand or more, has led him to write a sequel entitled "That's Me All Over, Mable" (Stokes, \$0.75) which Corporal Breck illustrates. "Advance, friend, and give the discount," reports "Bill," is the way one of them "Jewish fellas from New York" who was on sentry-go challenged a stranger. The course of true love does not appear to be going much smoother for Bill than formerly. He meets with several social mishaps, almost secures a furlough that really belonged to Patrick Smith, and the book ends with a letter from the fickle Mable herself.—B. Van Vorst's "Popular History of France" (Stokes, \$1.00) aims to "embody the essential facts in a form easily assimilated in a brief two hours" and seems to be a belated attempt to meet the needs of the American soldiers in France. Considering its scope and purpose, the volume is quite satisfactory, though more should have been said about the country's Catholicism, and the Church's rehabilitation of Joan of Arc should have been noted.—"The Conversion of Two Lutheran Ministers to the Roman Catholic Church in 1863" (J. Schaffer, \$0.25) by Rev. Ignatius Zeller, describes the uphill road two bosom friends had to travel on entering the Catholic Church. Truths, like the Blessed Sacrament, the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, the communion of saints, purgatory and prayers for the dead, offered no small obstacles, but all were encountered and freely accepted. Before their abjuration of heresy the two converts found a happy haven at St. John's College, Fordham.—"A Minister's Surrender, or How Truth Conquered Prejudice"

(Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind., \$0.15; \$7.00 a hundred) is an interesting account by Professor Charles W. Meyers, of San Antonio, Texas, of how he found his way from Methodism into the Catholic Church. He tells his Protestant readers: "If the Catholic principles in your Protestant creed were eliminated, you wouldn't have anything left but worthless shreds." "No other institution on earth holds up a higher standard of right living than does the Catholic Church; and this is the test by which she asks to be judged."—H. M. Riggle professes to have written "in a spirit of Christian love and courtesy toward the millions of Roman Catholic friends in all parts of the world" a book entitled "Roman Catholicism in the Light of Their Own Scriptures and Authorities" (Gospel Trumpet Co., Anderson, Ind.) which is a bitter and ignorant attack on what Catholics hold sacred. His "arguments" seem to be based on a Second Adventist's Biblical exegesis.

"Collective Bargaining and Trade Agreements in the Brewery, Metal, Teaming and Building Trades of San Francisco" (University of California) is a careful and minute survey by Ira B. Cross of the trade agreements in force among these four groups of industries in May, 1915. The author shows that, outside the building trades, which followed a contrary policy, collective bargaining, based on trade agreements has been an unquestioned success in San Francisco. The data and facts brought out in the writer's investigation, on the whole, manifest mutual fairness and fidelity on the part of both labor and capital. The lesson conveyed is, that effective collective bargaining and the drafting of joint agreements, fair to both employers and employees, are possible only where both sides are thoroughly and permanently organized. It is to be hoped that the closer relationship between employer and employee, involved in collective bargaining, will become more widespread, prove an effective preventive to strikes and lockouts and help bring about that industrial democracy wherein the workman, no longer a mere tool, will meet his employer on a basis of equality and decide the questions of wages, hours and conditions of employment according to the principles of justice and charity.

The long-expected "Poems" of Father Gerard Manley Hopkins, S.J., have recently been published in England. Mr. Robert Bridges, the Poet Laureate, has edited the volume and furnished it with notes. The London *Times Literary Supplement* in a favorable review of the volume quotes the following lines from a poem entitled "That Nature Is a Heraclitean Fire and the Comfort of the Resurrection" as typical of the author and ends the notice with the subjoined comment:

Manshape, that shone
Sheer off, dissevered, a star, death blots black out; nor mark
Is any of him at all so stark
But vastness blurs and time beats level. Enough! the Resurrection,
A heart's-clarion! Away grief's gasping, joyless days, dejection,

Across my foundering deck shone
A beacon, an eternal beam. Flesh fade, and mortal trash
Fall to the residuary worm; world's wildfire, leave but ash;
In a flash, at a trumpet crash,
I am all at once what Christ is, since he was what I am, and
This Jack, joke, poor potsherd, patch, matchwood, immortal diamond,

Is immortal diamond.

The whole book thrills with spirit, a spirit that does not disdain sense but heightens it. The poems are crowded with objects sharply cut, and with sounds no less sharp and clashing; you fight your way through the verses, yet they draw you on. There is beauty everywhere without luxury, the beauty that seems to come of painful intense watching, the utter, disinterested delight of one who sees another world, not through, but in this one. It is as if he heard everywhere a music too difficult, because too beautiful, for our ears and noted down what he could catch of it; authentic fragments that we trust even when they bewilder us.

EDUCATION

A Letter and an Answer

FROM time to time, AMERICA has brought to the attention of its readers, the National League of Teacher-Mothers at Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, an institution founded and now conducted by Miss Ella Frances Lynch. A practical example of the League's methods is afforded by the following letter, written by the mother of a boy of three, living on a farm, and Miss Lynch's answer:

I find it difficult, writes the mother, to allow this child the proper amount of freedom, and at the same time to teach him to respect the rights of others. He has a quick temper, striking or kicking when crossed, although his temper can soon be changed. I usually take him on my lap, and set his mind on something pleasant. His father thinks a spanking is the right cure, but Professor Blank says in his "Psychology" that a child should be reasoned with, until he obeys. This is the only point on which I am not convinced that my husband is absolutely right.

JOHN'S PROGRAM

OUR prosperous neighbors do not approve of anything along the lines of home teaching. They seem to get very little pleasure out of life aside from the hoarding of money. They distrust education and disapprove of spending money for books. They want to know how to make more money at farming.

I enjoyed your first lesson on nature study. I shall have to learn about nature at the same time that I am teaching John. I always lived in a city until my marriage and never studied about birds, animals, insects, and so on. I must take the time that will be most convenient for the rest of the family to teach the daily lessons. John's tasks usually consist of such things as I am working at myself, and his play, of course, has to be governed in the same way. For instance, he plays in the barn while I milk, and around the chickens while I work there, and in the garden or out in the truck patches, wherever my work happens to be.

This is his daily program: Rise at 5:30 a. m.; breakfast, 6:00; glass of milk, 9:00; dinner, 12:30; nap, 1:30-4:30; supper, 6:00; bed, 8:00.

These are his daily tasks: Help to gather eggs, feed chickens, collect silverware after meals, empty table-scraps, place chairs to and from table, bring or take anything that he is told.

I shall look forward to the next set of lessons.

THE ANSWER

YOU are quite right, answers Miss Lynch, in your aims to teach this little boy to respect the rights of others and to keep each thing in its proper place. Thus you lay the foundation for essential habits, established now far more readily than later; habits that will make him a strong and happy man and a good citizen. Now, never lose patience. Repeat the simplest lesson again and again. Contrary to the generally accepted notion, children learn slowly. Do not forget that it takes many months, nay years, to establish the simplest good habit. The child is indeed learning bit by bit, but it takes much time and incessant repetition to inculcate the consciousness of the simplest idea. Regularity in feeding, sleeping, playing, and so on, are also of prime importance. Your good sense will not lead you astray on these points.

The tasks you speak of are excellent. Make the child understand that everybody must work and that everyone has to help make things pleasant for others. Do not ask him to do these things. Tell him what to do; show him several times, if necessary; then make him do it. Should he refuse to do these little tasks regularly and promptly, you must use compulsion. When he discovers that dislike of work will not free him from responsibility, he will no longer kick against the goad. The earlier you can overcome this natural resistance to regular work, the easier it will be for your boy to learn, and the less need there will be of resorting to force.

PUNISHMENT

YOUR husband is right. Fits of temper cannot be cured by words only. You will find that as a child grows older and stronger, an acquired bad habit strengthens. I know that many notable educationists oppose corporal inflictions. Many parents, to their lasting sorrow, have found out that this is wrong. Psychologists and psychists have,

within the past twenty-five years, wrought more damage to the American nation than can be mended within generations. Our statesmen and generals say that only stern military discipline necessitated by this war, will save the nation. It is not kindness to allow children to cultivate habits that make for unhappiness. Check them at the first indication. Tell the child what to do. If he flies into a temper instead of obeying, use a little switch, or what is most effective, a limber corset-steel. The physical sting is what the child needs as a counter-irritant.

Try this. I have never known it to fail when used with judgment. Coaxing and bribing, in the long run, invariably fail. Discipline once established, the child under control, it will be simple to teach other lessons as the child becomes docile. Without firm control that will lead in due time to strong-willed self-control, there can be no real education.

NATURE STUDY

YOU must not be discouraged because you have had little opportunity to learn something about nature by personal experience. You now have that opportunity; you realize what you have missed, and you are prepared to make an effort to get it. You have a great deal to be thankful for in the educational opportunities offered by your present surroundings. How I wish that every pupil in my home kindergarten class could have such a schoolroom; a big farm, furnished with trees and flowers and vegetables and cows and chickens! To live and learn in such a place promises true education.

How shall you avail yourself of this? You are now learning things of real value every day. Every time you milk the cows, you are training the senses: eye, ear, smell, touch, and this quickening of the senses, this gathering of new impressions, gives you new ideas, new food for thought. Such things do not flourish in college courses nor come to one from text-books. Avail yourself of the milking-time to teach John a lesson in observation. Make him stroke the cow's side, to notice the difference in his feeling in stroking up and stroking down, thus teaching the difference between *rough* and *smooth*. Make him notice the color of the cow, and whether it is uniform or spotted. Thus your boy will learn the right meaning and use of words.

Teach him the correct name for various parts of the animal's body: horn, hoof, knee, nostril, dewlap, udder, one at a time. A little child cannot learn more than one or two new words a day. Take care to pronounce each new word slowly and correctly, many times. A teacher should never take things for granted, especially not that a child understands a thing because it has been told once. Patient and frequent repetition and questioning are necessary. Teach him to look attentively at the hoof; to note color, shape, smoothness, hardness; point out the track the hoof makes. Lead him to see the differences between a cow's hoof and that of a pig or sheep or horse.

Now, the knowledge of facts by itself is of little use; but it becomes very useful when used to help form the habit of observing closely and combining correctly. You will find yourself greatly interested in seeking new truths about familiar objects. You know, when someone asked Agassiz, the great scientist and teacher, what he considered the great work of his life, he replied: "I have helped men to observe." It is said of him that he would require a pupil to study one fish for three weeks before assigning him a new lesson. Your boy will not be ready for the less obvious things until he is much older. But you can make up a catechism for yourself concerning the cow: "Where are the hairs long? short? pointing downwards? sideways? The eye; its color, size, shape, position. Teeth in each jaw? Motion of the jaws in grazing? In chewing?"

"NOT HOW MUCH BUT HOW LITTLE"

WHEN you and your boy have observed your cows for three weeks, write me what you have learned and what John has learned, and continue until you hear from me again. You must understand me rightly and teach your boy only what is suitable for his tender years and understanding. Show your wisdom not in how much you teach him but how little you teach him.

When teaching John the lessons on memorizing, which accompany this letter, be very careful to go ahead slowly and surely. Explain each word, each phrase, each clause, each sentence before making the child say it and learn it. Make him take a deep breath at each pause, as indicated by the punctuation. Make him stand upright when he recites, with his hands folded either in front or behind, and with his feet in the right position, that is, as a soldier

stands at ease, changing from time to time, from one foot to the other. Thus you will combat incipient nervousness.

If you have a calendar, you might also let John mark off every morning at a regular hour, the previous date. If you have not one, you can easily make one for the month, just for this purpose.

Tell me how many of the enclosed lessons John has learned when you write me. I shall then plan new lessons for you. You must feel free to ask me any questions if I have not made myself clear.

This plan of training children should be considered by all mothers anxious to do their best by their offspring.

JOHN STEVENSON.

ECONOMICS

"General Condonation"

WHEN under date of August 1, 1917, the Pope sent a communication to the belligerents, the recommendation most unacceptable to the war lords, was that there should be a "general condonation" in the matter of paying for damages and the cost of the war. It was almost assumed that such a suggestion could come only from a pro-German. Yet the Pope's solution is the only conclusion that could be arrived at by economically intelligent men who loved their country first, to whatever nation they owed allegiance. In fact, two years before this, a British statesman pointed out the proper basis of a settlement. A cable dated London, December 25, 1915, reads in part:

War Indemnity Out Of Question, Says British M. P. Joseph King, Economic Expert, Says Payment of Big Sum After Hostilities Are Ended Is Impossible.—Demand Might Help Defeated Enemy.

Take, for example, the huge indemnity paid after 1871 by France to Germany. As a consequence of this the prosperity and trade of France were recuperative and progressive, while Germany was depressed and suffering. . . . Now, to pay \$5,000,000,000 from one side to another is impossible in gold. Even if gold payments could be made the immediate result would only be to immensely inflate prices in the country receiving the gold.

If Germany's wonderful productivity and trading enterprises are to be revived after the war in order to pay indemnities to her enemies, it means that the enemies will have to trade with her far more than they did before the war. . . . Will those of the Allies who have been protectionists before, notably Russia (*or the United States now*), become free trade in order that German workers may produce profits to pay indemnity?

France would not pay an indemnity after 1871, and could not have been forced, unless the payment was to the advantage of her business men. And Germany would not accept an indemnity unless it was an advantage to her bondholders. The workers of both countries suffered, though in different ways: The German workers were out of employment; the French workers got a lessened return for their labor. The French business men, however, made a profit, over and above their taxes, on all goods paid as indemnity. The German capitalists, also, were probably able to absorb the billion dollars of new wealth which cost them nothing, for they were but realizing on their war bonds which had represented their book profits.

GREEK GIFTS

FROM an unexpected quarter, under date of January 20, 1919, comes a confirmation of the wisdom of "general condonation." In a specially advertised article, "written for the Providence Journal by Stephen Leacock, appears the following:

If Germany hands us over a billion dollars of free coal, our coal miners are ruined; a billion dollars worth of cotton goods and our cotton industry goes to the wall; a billion dollars worth of structural steel and our steel industry collapses in a heap; a billion dollars worth of paintings, statues and works of art and our artists die like flies.

Yet Lloyd George has so great faith in the ignorance of his people that he promises them that he will not allow Germany to pay in "cheap goods"; at the same time he says he will demand indemnity to the limit. Of course, the cheaper the goods,

the more Germany would have to give. Perhaps the British Prime Minister is warranted in his assumption; for Hartly Withers, in referring to our foremost banker's description of Americans as a "nation of economic illiterates," writes: "If this be true of America it is perhaps even truer of England." And again, the same noted English economist puts it: "The public, on all subjects connected with money matters, is so abysmally ignorant that its monetary knowledge may be said to be a minus quantity." There is great danger that the Germans will insist on paying an indemnity to every country that will accept one. There is no more convenient method of "commercial penetration." When they get the markets they can keep them, at the highest price for their goods. The bondholders in the various countries see only their own immediate benefit and will sacrifice the interests of their respective people.

OUR TRADE BALANCE

CONSIDERING the welfare of a nation as a whole, the difference between "a favorable balance of trade" and paying an indemnity is all in favor of the indemnity. An increasing "favorable balance of trade" demands free trade, that the "balance" may be drawn on when convenient. We have acquired a favorable trade balance of more than \$10,000,000,000 in the last four years. That means we have not been paid for our shipments. Yet everybody is happy. And our bankers now warn us against accepting payment, and say we should increase enormously our "favorable balance." The German capitalists are apt to be of the same school of finance; and as the people of all the nations are anxious to make the Germans work, there promises to be a great opening for goods "Made in Germany."

Perhaps it was not the economic view that prompted the Pope's counsel of "general condonation." And if not, it must have been the inspiration of a prayerful soul.

M. P. CONNERY.

NOTE AND COMMENT

A Super-Volant General

MAJOR GENERAL LEONARD WOOD, recently appointed to the command of the central department of the United States Army, marked his arrival in Chicago by an act which will undoubtedly cause pain to many salaried reformers in these United States. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, no sooner had he taken his desk at headquarters than he sent the "No Smoking" warnings to the waste-basket.

After a short time, General Wood glanced around and said: "There doesn't seem to be anyone smoking around here. What's the matter? Don't any of you smoke?" "There's an order against it," one of the officers volunteered. "Well, that order is off," said General Wood.

Is General Wood about to begin an intensive training to fit himself for the next war? If he can withstand the attacks and obloquy leveled against him by the Anti-Saloon League and similar "religio-political" cliques, he need not fear a cannonading from the largest group of "Big Berthas" ever assembled.

To What the K. of C. Welcomes Its New Members

AN incidental notice in the *London Universe* that the Knights of Columbus, active in various parts of Great Britain, have placed 100 sets of the Catholic Encyclopaedia in the British public libraries and organizations, again recalls to mind their membership drive with its goal of 1,000,000 men. We hope that not one will be wanting to the final count, and that all may be found worthy to continue the glorious traditions now established by the Order. "To what," asks the *Columbiad*, "would the K. of C. welcome its new members?"

To the frank brotherhood of an Order that has attained the highest distinction through unselfish Christian generosity in its service to the nation. To the same hearty fellowship

that made of the K. of C. huts behind the lines and in the cantonments the social centers of our army. To the same cheerful associations by which relief from the horrors of battle and the tedium of training was given in simple unaffected fellowship. Aye, and welcome to the higher things of life, the work of fraternal progress, broad education, social and religious enlightenment, that even before the world war had given the Knights of Columbus an enduring prestige.

All this will the new Knights find in the organization that is now opening its arms to receive them. "It is because the problems of humanity are so beset with serious dangers that the Knights of Columbus must number 1,000,000." Eighty per cent of these, it is hoped, will be insurance members, thus keeping their pledge, in the most practical way, "to protect the home and its loved ones."

Death-Rate of Babies and Low Wages

IN her annual report, Miss Julia C. Lathrop, chief of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor, again shows the intimate relation between low wages and the high death-rate of babies. The entire argument is graphically set forth in a carefully prepared chart, which indicates that the death-rate for babies whose fathers earned less than \$450 was 167.8 per 1,000 births, or more than one in every six. When, however, the father earned \$1,250 or more, the death-rate for the babies fell to 64.3 per 1,000 births, or only one in sixteen. The investigations were carried on in eight cities, and the mothers of nearly 25,000 live-born babies were interviewed by the bureau's agents. The report admits that a general increase in wages has taken place since these figures were compiled, but adds that owing to the equally general increases in the cost of living we are not safe in drawing the conclusion that: "The advantage to infant life can be at this time in proportion to the presumable increase in father's cash earnings."

Anglo-Saxons and Anglo-Celts

THE eminent English scientist, Sir E. Ray Lankester, is a bit wrought up over the fact that people insist on abusing the sacred terms, Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celt. In a recent letter to the *London Times* he says:

The attempt to apply to existing nationalities and peoples names involving a statement of their racial constituents is open to the objections (a) that such names are almost invariably incorrect and misleading; (b) that they are frequently used in order to disseminate baseless prejudice.

The people of Great Britain are not Anglo-Saxons, nor are they correctly described as Anglo-Celts; nor does either name apply with any degree of accuracy to the people of the United States of America. Both are English-speaking peoples, and that is the only designation which applies equally to them and to the peoples of the British Dominions and commonwealth overseas. The term Celtic is hopelessly wrong and confusing as popularly used to indicate racial elements in the British Islands, though less open to objection when limited to the designation of language, literature, and culture which is closely related to that of the great Alpine or Celtic race of Europe.

It is to be hoped that the "Anglo-Saxons" of America do not read this item; they would die of grief, and the world is short of mirth, as it is.

Church and State

THE Methodists of the United States are sticklers for the separation of Church and State, so much so, in fact, that they raise a mighty clamor at the least suspicion of "civic friendship for Rome." On the other hand they are not at all adverse to enlisting the aid of State officials in their own behalf, as this letter sent to United States senators shows:

The Methodist Episcopal Church is in a great campaign for after-war and reconstruction work in France, Italy, Belgium and other war-devastated places. Also for war-

work in America. The Church is seeking 53,000 men, religious workers, and \$85,000,000. Enclosed is an article containing letters from Governors Lowden of Illinois, Harrington of Maryland, and Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania. We are asking all the senators to give us a brief word of encouragement and appreciation.

The French, Belgians and Italians will be glad to know that American governors and senators have been requested to help the Methodists evangelize them. But perhaps these benighted foreigners have sat in Papal darkness so long that they will not recognize the new Gospel light when they see it. They may confuse it with the glint of gold.

Employments Unsuitable to Women

IN the annual report of the Division of Labor of the Railroad Administration admission is made of the mistakes that had been committed in applying women to occupations unsuitable to them. Attention was often called by us to this point and to the need of exercising greater discrimination in the selection of work for women:

It became apparent several months ago that the employment of women in certain occupations was objectionable. Their use as section laborers, for instance, was judged by the Director General to be unsuitable owing to the heavy work and to the surroundings, women and young girls being employed in gangs with men along the tracks at long distances from any house or station.

Objection was also taken to the employment of women as truckers in depots and warehouses on account of the excessive physical exertion required. In view of the wages now paid it was believed possible to secure men and to transfer the women to some class of work suitable to their strength and with proper regard to their health. The railroads were accordingly asked by the Director General to discontinue their employment both as section laborers and as truckers, September 27, 1918.

Similarly, the work of calling train and engine crews was not approved for women (November 7, 1918). The service requires that the caller must find the train or engine man for whom she is looking, who is often asleep at his home, hotel, or boarding house or caboose, where he must be awakened and his signature secured as acknowledging the call. For obvious reasons the railroads were requested to dismiss women from this occupation.

Under these orders, on one railroad employing more than 2,000 women, 223 employed as laborers and 193 employed as truckers were transferred to other jobs or dismissed. Another railroad which in August employed 145 truckers has now entirely given up this form of work for women. The full cooperation of the railroad officials has been secured in making these important changes.

The woman-labor question, as connected with the unemployment of men, will be one of the most difficult of our after-war problems.

Growth of the Protestant Churches

THE thirty Protestant denominations constituting the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America are accredited, in the new Year Book of the Churches, with a total membership of 18,620,136, and with 14,345,298 "scholars" in their Sunday schools. The value of their church property is estimated at \$1,040,236,194. The general rate of increase for all religious bodies in the United States is said to have been good during the last decade, but certain denominations are singled out for special mention in this regard. The Methodist Episcopal Church, with a membership of 3,718,396, reports an increase of twenty-five per cent, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with 2,108,061 communicants, shows an addition of twenty-eight per cent. The Presbyterian Church, in the United States, now enrolls 1,613,056, and therefore claims a growth of thirty-seven per cent during the same decade. The Congregational Church, with 790,163 communicants, has increased thirteen per cent; the Protestant Episcopal,

with 1,098,173 communicants, twenty-four per cent; the Baptist Church, with a combined membership of 1,227,448 in the various organizations reporting to the Northern Convention, sixteen per cent, and the colored Baptists, with a membership of 3,018,341, thirty-three per cent. The Disciples of Christ, whose communion now numbers 1,231,404, have increased twenty-four per cent. The Sunday-school reports give a total of 19,951,165 children enrolled, and almost 2,000,000 teachers and officers. There has consequently been an increase of 5,250,000 over the figures of ten years previous. The largest increase in the Sunday-school gains has been on the part of the Disciples of Christ, amounting to fifty per cent. The Methodist Episcopal schools number 3,872,200 pupils, with 391,922 officers and teachers, while the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has 1,683,245 pupils, instructed by 152,551 teachers. It will be well for Catholics carefully to ponder these figures, and to compare them with the relatively small number of pupils in our own schools. There is no time for silly self-laudation, but there is need of the most intense activity on the part of all, from Cardinals and Bishops down to the least among the Faithful.

The American Mohammedans

THE Prohibitionists are still drunk with the joy of victory and, as was to be expected, are rolling off yards of intemperate language against all who dare disagree with their unethical point of view. They have never been logical, probably because Mohammedan fanaticism stultifies reason. Does this Oriental distortion of soul by which men hate harmless wine and love moral filth, also blind the American Mohammedans to truth? Their latest "publicity stuff" would indicate that the question must be answered in the affirmative. Just now the Mohammedans have found a worthy antagonist in the Rev. John Belford of Brooklyn, who stands up to the "piffle" of the Anti-Saloon League, in part, as follows:

You say I am seditious! It is my American spirit which makes me writhe under legislation which curtails my liberty. Personally, it would not matter to me if there were not a drop of liquor in America; but I despise and detest the cowards whom you have whipped into telling me that I may not do what I know I have a right to do. This, sir, is tyranny, and every real man hates a tyrant.

The advocates have sent paid agents into every legislature. They haunt the halls and the committee rooms. They invade the hotels and boarding houses. They hold up the legislators on the street, in the shops, in the churches. They use every means evil genius can suggest to secure votes. The very men whom they annoy and intimidate hate and despise them. They flood the locality with all sorts of vile tracts, mendacious figures and baseless charges. There is no depth of shame too low for them to crawl into; nothing too vile for them to sniff it and taste it, and then vomit it out upon the world, with its vileness multiplied because of its lodgment in their unclean minds.

They assail the veracity of men like Cardinal Gibbons. They attribute selfish and sordid motives to the very best citizens. They insinuate that the money of the rich brewer and the wealthy distiller determines the policy of our Church and the voice of our preachers. They call us disloyal, seditious! They charge, allege and insinuate, but they never prove anything.

Father Belford's statements about the paid agents of the League are borne out once again by a press dispatch from Providence, which declares that the State Senate in refusing to ratify the Amendment "put the quietus on one of the most annoying lobbying campaigns the officers of the Anti-Saloon League have carried on in this country." Thus the row grows, but apparently worse is to come, for if the plan of Essex County (N. J.) Building Trade's Council is carried out, 75,000 New Jersey workmen will strike on July 1, in protest against "bone-dryness." Our Mohammedans refused to allow citizens the referendum; the citizens will inaugurate a referendum of their own, and a dangerous one it is.